arXiv:1511.01678v1 [math.OA] 5 Nov 2015

# MULTIPLICATION OPERATORS ON THE BERGMAN SPACE OF BOUNDED DOMAINS IN $\mathbb{C}^d$

HANSONG HUANG DECHAO ZHENG

**Abstract:** In this paper we study multiplication operators on Bergman spaces of higher dimensional domains and those von Neumann algebras induced by them. We will show an interplay of geometry, function theory and operator algebra. Local inverses, the Hartogs phenomena and $L^2_a$-removable sets will play an important role in the study.

## 1. Introduction

Let $\Omega$ denote a bounded domain in the complex space $\mathbb{C}^d$, and $dA$ the Lebesgue measure on $\Omega$. The Bergman space $L^2_a(\Omega)$ is the Hilbert space consisting of all holomorphic functions over $\Omega$ which are square integrable with respect to $dA$. For a holomorphic map $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$, let $JF$ denote the determinant of the Jacobian of $F$.

For a bounded holomorphic function $\phi$ over $\Omega$, let $M_{\phi,\Omega}$ denote the multiplication operator with the symbol $\phi$ on $L^2_a(\Omega)$, given by

$$M_{\phi,\Omega} f = \phi f,\ f \in L^2_a(\Omega).$$

In general, for a tuple $\Phi = \{\phi_j : 1 \le j \le n\}$, let $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ denote the commutant of $\{M_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le n\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}' &= \{M_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le n\}' \\ &= \{T \in B(L^2_a(\Omega)) : TM_{\phi_j,\Omega} = M_{\phi_j,\Omega}T \ for\ 1 \le j \le n\}. \end{aligned}$$

where $B(L^2_a(\Omega))$ denotes the algebra of bounded operators on the Bergman space $L^2_a(\Omega)$ and $M_{\Phi,\Omega}$ denotes a family of multiplication operators. Let $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ denote the von Neumann algebra

$$\{M_{\phi_j,\Omega},\ M^*_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le n\}',$$

consisting of all bounded operators on $L^2_a(\Omega)$ which commutes with both $M_{\phi_j,\Omega}$ and its adjoint $M^*_{\phi_j,\Omega}$ for each $j$. In fact, there is a correspondence between orthogonal projections in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ and joint reducing subspaces of $\{M_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le n\}$ [20, 21, 24]. Precisely, the range of an orthogonal projection in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ must be a joint reducing subspaces of $\{M_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le n\}$, and vice versa. We say that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is trivial if $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega) = \mathbb{C}I$. This is equivalent to that $\{M_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le n\}$ has no nonzero joint reducing subspace other than the whole space. In single-variable case, investigations on commutants and reducing subspaces of multiplication operators and von Neumann algebras induced by those operators

*Key words and phrases.* multiplication operators; admissible local inverse; $L^2_a$-removable; von Neumann algebra; holomorphic proper map.

*2000 AMS Subject Classification:* 47A13; 32H35.

have been done in [12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 35, 36, 37] and some special multi-variable cases have been studied in [18, 26, 38, 39].

On the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$, a remarkable result on commutants [12, 36, 37] states that if $\phi$ is a nonconstant holomorphic function over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then there exist a finite Blaschke product $B$ and an $H^\infty$-function $\psi$ such that $\phi = \psi(B)$ and

$$\{M_{\phi,\mathbb{D}}\}' = \{M_{B,\mathbb{D}}\}'. \tag{1.1}$$

This gives

$$\mathcal{V}^*(\phi, \mathbb{D}) = \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D}).$$

It is shown in [20, 21] that $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$ is of finite dimensional if $B$ is a finite Blaschke product, and thus $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\phi, \mathbb{D}) < \infty$. In fact, in [36] the notion of admissible local inverse plays an important role (see Section 2 for the notion). All admissible local inverses of $\phi$ are exactly those of $B$, and each local inverse of $B$ is necessarily admissible. Using the local inverses and their analytic continuations yields an operator $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ on the Bergman space $L^2_a(\mathbb{D})$ defined by

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]} h = \sum_{\sigma \in [\rho]} h \circ \sigma \, J\sigma, h \in L^2_a(\mathbb{D}), \tag{1.2}$$

where $[\rho]$ denotes the equivalent class of $\rho$, consisting of all analytic continuations of $\rho$, and the sum involves only finitely many terms. Indeed, it has been shown in [20] that $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi, \mathbb{D})$ is exactly the linear span of $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ where $\rho$ runs over all admissible local inverses of $\phi$ or $B$ and for each Blaschke product $B$, the dimension $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$ of $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$ equals the number of components of a Riemann surface $\mathcal{S}_B$ defined by $B$. In this paper we will obtain some generalizations of the above results in multi-variable case and also show some differences of the above results in multi-variable case.

First we need some mild properties of a bounded domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$:

(1) The boundary $\partial\Omega$ of $\Omega$ is of Lebesgue measure zero in $\mathbb{C}^d$;
(2) For each point $\zeta \in \partial\Omega$ and any open neighborhood $\mathcal{O}(\zeta)$ of $\zeta$, $\mathcal{O}(\zeta) - \Omega$ contains an open ball.

Note that (2) is equivalent to $\overline{\mathbb{C}^d - \overline{\Omega}} \supseteq \partial\Omega$. All star-shaped domains with smooth boundary, circled bounded domains and strictly pseudoconvex domains satisfy properties (1) and (2). In fact, if for each point $\lambda$ on $\partial\Omega$, there is a neighborhood $V$ of $\lambda$ such that all points $z$ in $V \cap \partial\Omega$ enjoy this property: up to a rotation, $\operatorname{Im} z_d$ can be presented as a function of $z_1, \cdots, z_{d-1}$ and $\operatorname{Re} z_d$, then $\Omega$ enjoys properties (1) and (2). A convex domain always satisfies (2). A strictly pseudoconvex domain $\Omega$ with a smooth $C^2$-smooth boundary satisfies (1) and (2). To see this, the smoothness of boundary gives (1); and strict pseudoconvexity shows that $\Omega$ is locally biholomorphically equivalent to strictly convex domains [27], which gives (2). On the other hand, we will show that not all bounded domains $\Omega$ satisfy (1) or (2) in Example 4.1.

We have the following theorem for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose that $\Omega$ satisfies the properties (1) and (2), $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ and the image of $\Phi$ has an interior point. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is a finite dimensional von Neumann algebra. Furthermore, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, where $\rho$ run over admissible local inverses of $\Phi$.*

If the image of $\Phi$ does not have an interior point, in Example 4.5, we will show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ may be of infinite dimension. Theorem 1.1 also gives the following criterion of nontrivialness of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$.

**Corollary 1.2.** *Suppose both $\Omega$ and $\Phi$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is nontrivial if and only if there exists an admissible local inverse of $\Phi$ distinct from the identity.*

For $d = 1$, the assumption in Corollary 1.2 says that $\Phi$ is nonconstant and holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$. In the special case of $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$, Corollary 1.2 is implicitly contained in [36]. If $\Omega$ is a polygon, then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is often trivial; the nontrivialness of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ implies some geometric property of the polygon $\Omega$ [25].

In the definition of the operator $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, for each function $h$ in $L^2_a(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h$ is a well-defined holomorphic function on $\Omega - A$, where $A$ is a relative closed subset of $\Omega$. This set $A$ is "small" and one can show all such function $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h$ lies in $L^2_a(\Omega - A)$. In the case of the unit disk, $A$ is a countable subset of $\mathbb{D}$, and thus by complex analysis one can show easily

$$L^2_a(\mathbb{D} - A) = L^2_a(\mathbb{D}).$$

However, if $\Omega$ is a higher dimensional domain, $A$ is usually something like a zero variety, and hence $A$ is far from discrete. We must show that each function in $L^2_a(\Omega - A)$ extends analytically to $\Omega$. This naturally involves a problem of removability. Precisely, a relatively closed subset $\mathcal{E}$ of $\Omega$ is called *$L^2_a$-removable* in $\Omega$ if each function in $L^2_a(\Omega - \mathcal{E})$ extends analytically to a function in $L^2_a(\Omega)$ [5, 10]. It is known that for a zero variety $E$ of a domain $\Omega$, $E$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$ [3, 6]. We will need a generalization of this result.

Throughout this paper, for a subset $E$ of $\Omega$, $\overline{E}$ always denotes the closure of $E$ in $\overline{\Omega}$. A zero variety $E$ of $\Omega$ is called *good* if for each point $\lambda \in \overline{\Omega}$, there is an open ball $U$ centered at $\lambda$ such that

$$U \cap \overline{E} = \{z \in U \cap \overline{\Omega} : h(z) = 0\},$$

where $h$ is a holomorphic function on $U$. For example, if $h$ is a nonconstant holomorphic function over $\overline{\Omega}$, then $\{z \in \Omega : h(z) = 0\}$ is a good zero variety of $\Omega$. For a map $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$, define

$$F^{-1}(F(\overline{E})) = \{z \in \Omega : F(z) \in F(\overline{E})\}.$$

**Theorem 1.3.** *Suppose that $E$ is a good zero variety of a domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$ and $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that the image of $F$ contains an interior point. Then both $F(\overline{E})$ and $F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$ are $L^2_a$-removable.*

Note that in Theorem 1.3, $F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$, but $F(\overline{E})$ is $L^2_a$-removable in any domain containing $F(\Omega)$. Theorem 1.3 tells us more than itself. Letting $F$ be the identity map, we know that each good zero variety is $L^2_a$-removable. Since a zero variety can be presented as a union of countably many good zero varieties, a zero variety is also $L^2_a$-removable [3, 6].

As mentioned before, if $\Phi$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\mathbb{D}) = \mathcal{V}^*(B,\mathbb{D})$ for some finite Blaschke product $B$ and all holomorphic proper maps on $\mathbb{D}$ must be of the form $h \circ B$, for some finite Blaschke product $B$ and a biholomorphic map $h$ from $\mathbb{D}$ onto its image [15]. Thus we will focus on the structure of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ for a holomorphic proper map $\Phi$. The following result shows that in most cases $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is nontrivial for a holomorphic proper map $\Phi$ on $\Omega$.

**Theorem 1.4.** *Suppose $\Phi : \Omega \to \Omega'$ is a holomorphic proper map. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is nontrivial if and only if $\Phi$ is not biholomorphic.*

Recall that a holomorphic proper map is always onto [33, Proposition 15.1.5], and hence a holomorphic proper map is biholomorphic if and only if it is univalent.

In higher dimensional case, "nontrivial" proper maps may be made of polynomials. For example, both $(z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2)$ and $(z_1^2 z_2^4, z_1^2 + z_2^4)$ are holomorphic proper maps on $\mathbb{D}^2$. Also, we have to pointed out that $(z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2)$ is also a holomorphic proper map on $\mathbb{B}_2$, but $(z_1^2 z_2^4, z_1^2 + z_2^4)$ is not. More details about these maps are contained in Section 6.

As in [20], let

$$\mathcal{S}_\Phi = \{(z, w) \in \Omega^2 : \Phi(z) = \Phi(w),\ z \notin \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))\},$$

where $Z$ denotes the zero variety of $J\Phi$, the Jacobian of $\Phi$. Then $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$ is a complex manifold in $\mathbb{C}^{2d}$. We have the following.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Suppose $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, where $\rho$ are local inverses of $\Phi$. In particular, the dimension of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ equals the number of components of $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$, and it also equals the number of equivalent classes of local inverses of $\Phi$.*

Admissible local inverses will play an important role throughout this paper. In the proof of Theorem 1.5 in Section 5, we will show that all local inverses of a holomorphic proper map must be admissible. On the unit disk, a holomorphic proper map $\phi$ is a finite Blaschke product up to composition of a biholomorphic map and hence Theorem 1.5 generalizes the main result in [20].

However, concerning holomorphic proper maps there exist some differences between single variable and multi-variable cases. In known cases, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is always abelian if $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$ [19]. But in multi-variable situation, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ can be non-abelian; also, the deck transformation group $G(\Phi)$ can be both abelian and non-cyclic. Moreover, under a mild condition, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is $*$-isomorphic to the group von Neumann algebra $G(\Phi)$.

Finally, we will study what happens to the von Neumann $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ and $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ under the deformation of the domain $\Omega$. We will show that in multi-variable case they diverge a lot. Perhaps the Hartogs phenomena is behind this. We will show that under a slight deformation of $\Omega$, $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ does not increase and usually $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ becomes trivial, see Proposition 7.1 and Theorem 7.2. Some counterexamples are given to show that a generalization of the result in (1.1) fails in multi-variable case.

This paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries such as the notion of admissible local inverse, and some properties of holomorphic proper maps. In Section 3 a new approach is presented to prove that a zero variety is $L_a^2$-removable, and the idea is used to prove Theorem 1.3. In Section 4 we will present the proof of Theorem 1.1 and one will see how admissible local inverse matches $L_a^2$-removable property. In Section 5 the proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 will be exhibited. Section 6 will provide many examples of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. We will show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ has fruitful structures. In Section 7 we will study the change of the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ and the commutant $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ under the deformation of the domain $\Omega$.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we will introduce some basic notations and give some preliminaries. Notably, an essential generalization of admissible local inverse will be introduced in multi-variable case and the notion and some properties of holomorphic proper map will be presented.

Let $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ be a holomorphic map and $Z$ denote the zeros of the determinant of the Jacobian $JF$ of $F$. Then its image $F(Z)$ is called *the critical set* of $F$. Each point in $F(Z)$ is called a critical value, and each point in $F(\Omega) - F(Z)$ is called a regular point.

Let $\Omega$ and $\Omega'$ be domains in $\mathbb{C}^d$. A holomorphic function $\Psi : \Omega \to \Omega'$ is called *a proper map* if for any sequence $\{p_n\}$ of $\Omega$ without limit point in $\Omega$, $\{\Psi(p_n)\}$ has no limit point in $\Omega'$. This is equivalent to say that for each compact subset $K$ of $\Omega'$, $\Psi^{-1}(K)$ is compact. A holomorphic function $\Psi$ on $\Omega$ is called proper if $\Psi(\Omega)$ is open and $\Psi : \Omega \to \Psi(\Omega)$ is proper. In particular, if $\Psi$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$, then $\Psi$ is proper on $\Omega$ if and only if $\Psi(\Omega)$ is open and $\Psi(\partial\Omega) \subseteq \partial\Psi(\Omega)$. For example, a holomorphic proper map from the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ to $\mathbb{D}$ is exactly a finite Blaschke product. More generally, a holomorphic map $\Phi$ from $\mathbb{D}^d$ to $\mathbb{D}^d$ is proper if and only if up to a permutation of coordinates

$$\Phi(z) = (\phi_1(z_1), \cdots, \phi_d(z_d)),$$

where $\phi_j (1 \leq j \leq d)$ are finite Blaschke products [32, Theorem 7.3.3].

A holomorphic proper map is always onto [33, Proposition 15.1.5] and open. The following result is covered by [33, Theorem 15.1.6].

**Theorem 2.1.** *Suppose $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a holomorphic function and for each point $w \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $F^{-1}(w)$ is compact. Then $F$ is an open map.*

A holomorphic proper map is always an $m$-folds map. In addition, its critical set enjoys the following good properties [33, Theorem 15.1.9].

**Theorem 2.2.** *For two domains $\Omega$ and $\Omega'$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$, suppose $F : \Omega \to \Omega'$ is a holomorphic proper function. Let $\sharp(w)$ denote the number of elements in $F^{-1}(w)$ with $w \in \Omega'$. Then the following hold:*

1. *There is an integer $m$ such that $\sharp(w) = m$ for all regular values $w$ of $F$ and $\sharp(w') < m$ for all critical values $w'$ of $F$;*
2. *The critical set of $F$ is a zero variety in $\Omega'$.*

Let us introduce some notations about analytic continuation [34, Chapter 16]. A function element is an ordered pair $(f, D)$, where $D$ is a simply-connected domain and $f$ is a holomorphic function on $D$. Two function elements $(f_0, D_0)$ and $(f_1, D_1)$ are called direct continuations if $D_0 \cap D_1$ is not empty and $f_0(z)$ equals $f_1(z)$ for $z \in D_0 \cap D_1$. A curve is a continuous map from $[0, 1]$ into $\mathbb{C}^d$. Given a function element $(f_0, D_0)$ and a curve $\gamma$ with $\gamma(0) \in D_0$, if there are a partition of $[0, 1]$:

$$0 = s_0 < s_1 < \cdots < s_n = 1$$

and function elements $(f_j, D_j)(0 \leq j \leq n)$ such that

1. $(f_j, D_j)$ and $(f_{j+1}, D_{j+1})$ are direct continuation for all $j$ with $0 \leq j \leq n - 1$;
2. $\gamma[s_j, s_{j+1}] \subseteq D_j (0 \leq j \leq n - 1)$ and $\gamma(1) \in D_n$,

then $(f_n, D_n)$ is called *an analytic continuation of* $(f_0, D_0)$ *along* $\gamma$ ; and $(f_0, D_0)$ is called to *admit an analytic continuation along* $\gamma$. In this case, we write $f_0 \sim f_n$. Clearly, $\sim$ defines an equivalence and we write $[f]$ for *the equivalent class* of $f$.

Given a family $\{\phi_j\}$ of holomorphic maps over $\Omega(\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d)$, and a subdomain $\Delta$ of $\Omega$, a holomorphic function $\rho : \Delta \to \Omega$ is called *a local inverse of* $\{\phi_j\}$ on $\Delta$ if $\phi_j \circ \rho = \phi_j$ for all $j$. In particular, if $\Phi = (\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_d)$, $\rho$ is called a local inverse of $\Phi$ if $\Phi \circ \rho = \Phi$. On domains of higher dimension, it is possible that all $\phi_j$ can extend analytically to a larger domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$. For example, if $\Omega = \widetilde{\Omega} - K$ where $K$ is a compact subset of $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\dim \widetilde{\Omega} \geq 2$, by Hartogs' extension theorem all $\phi_j$ over $\Omega$ extend analytically to $\widetilde{\Omega}$. In such a situation, for $\Delta \subseteq \Omega$, $\rho : \Delta \to \widetilde{\Omega}$ is also called a local inverse of $\{\phi_j\}$ on $\Delta$ if

$$\phi_j \circ \rho = \phi_j$$

for all $j$ in the sense of analytic continuation. A local inverse is called *nontrivial* if it is not the identity map.

Recall that a subset $E$ of $\Omega$ is called *a zero variety* of $\Omega$ if there is a nonconstant holomorphic function $f$ on $\Omega$ such that $E = \{z \in \Omega | f(z) = 0\}$. Let

$$A = \overline{\Phi^{-1}\Big(\Phi(Z(J\Phi))\Big)}.$$

In fact, Proposition 3.5 tells us that $\Omega - A$ is connected. A local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is called *admissible* if for each curve $\gamma$ in $\Omega - A$, $\rho$ admits analytic continuation with values in $\Omega$, we say $\rho$ is *admissible with respect to* $A$. The notion of admissible local inverse was first introduced by Thomson [36] in single variable case, where $A$ is a discrete subset in $\Omega$.

For each map $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$, the deck transformation group $G(\Phi)$ of $\Phi$ consists of all holomorphic automorphism $\rho$ of $\Phi$ satisfying $\Phi \circ \rho = \Phi$. If all local inverses of a holomorphic map $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ lie in $G(\Phi)$, then $\Phi$ is called a regular map [29]. For example, it is known that a finite Blaschke product is regular if and only if it is of the form

$$m_1 \circ \varphi \circ m_2,$$

where both $m_1$ and $m_2$ are in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{D})$, and $\varphi(z) = z^n$ for some positive integer $n$ [23]. However, in multi-variable case we will see more examples induced by polynomials.

The following lemma is contained in [21]. For the special case that $\Lambda$ is a singlet, it is first proved in [1, Proposition 5.1] or [2, Proposition A.1].

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space and let $e_\lambda^k, f_\mu^k$ $(1 \leq k \leq n$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda)$ be vectors in $\mathcal{H}$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} e_\lambda^k \otimes e_\mu^k = \sum_{k=1}^{n} f_\lambda^k \otimes f_\mu^k, \ \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda.$$

*Then there is an $n \times n$ numerical unitary matrix $W$ such that*

$$W \begin{pmatrix} e_\lambda^1 \\ \vdots \\ e_\lambda^n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_\lambda^1 \\ \vdots \\ f_\lambda^n \end{pmatrix}, \ \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

## 3. $L_a^2$-REMOVABLE SETS

In this section we will show that some set like zero variety enjoys the $L_a^2$-removable property which is needed in the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.5.

The following result was obtained in [3, 6]. We include a different approach, and some ideas in the proof will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Suppose that $E$ is a zero variety of a domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$. Then $E$ is $L_a^2$-removable in $\Omega$.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume $d > 1$. First let us deal with a special case that $\Omega = \mathbb{D}^d$ and

$$E = \{z \in \Omega : z_d = 0\}.$$

Then

$$\Omega - E = \mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\}).$$

We will show that holomorphic functions in $L_a^2\big(\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\})\big)$ can extend analytically to members in $L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^d)$. Recall that $\{z^\beta : \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d\}$ is an orthogonal basis of $L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^d)$ and each function in $L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^d)$ exactly has the following expansion:

$$\sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d} c_\alpha z^\alpha,\ z \in \mathbb{D}^d,$$

where $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d} |c_\alpha|^2 \|z^\alpha\|^2 < \infty$. Let $g$ be a member in $L_a^2\big(\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\})\big)$. By expansion of Laurent series,

$$g(z) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d} c'_\alpha z^\alpha,\ z \in \mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\}).$$

Since $g \in L_a^2\big(\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\})\big)$, we have that $c'_\alpha = 0$ if $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Z}_+^d$, and

$$\int_{\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\})} |g(z)|^2 dA(z) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d} |c'_\alpha|^2 \|z^\alpha\|^2 < \infty.$$

This immediately gives $g \in L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^d)$, as desired.

In general, suppose $E$ is a zero variety of a domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$. We will show that $E$ is $L_a^2$-removable in $\Omega$. Let

$$E = \{z \in \Omega | f(z) = 0\},$$

where $f : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$ is a nonconstant holomorphic function. Let $h$ be a function in $L_a^2(\Omega - E)$. We need only to show that $h$ extends analytically to $\Omega$ since $E$ is of Lebesgue measure zero. Let $H = (z_1, \cdots, z_{d-1}, f)$. For $\lambda \in E$, if $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_d}(\lambda) \neq 0$,

$$JH(\lambda) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_d}(\lambda) \neq 0.$$

Thus there is a domain $U_1$ containing $\lambda$ so that $H$ is biholomorphic on a neighborhood of $\overline{U_1}$. Hence the biholomorphic map $H$ gives that $U_1 - E$ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\})$ (if necessary, $U_1$ will be replaced with a smaller domain). Since holomorphic functions in $L_a^2\big(\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times (\mathbb{D} - \{0\})\big)$ extend analytically to members in $L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^d)$, holomorphic functions in $L_a^2(U_1 - E)$ can extend analytically to members in $L_a^2(U_1)$. Therefore each holomorphic function $h \in L_a^2(\Omega - E)$ extends analytically to

$$\{z \in E | \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_d} \neq 0\} \cup (\Omega - E) = \{z \in \Omega | \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_d} \neq 0\} \cup (\Omega - E).$$

Let

$$\Lambda_j = \{w \in \Omega | \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(w) \neq 0\}, 1 \leq j \leq d,$$

and for $r = 1, 2, \cdots$,

$$\Lambda_{j_1,\cdots,j_r} = \{w \in \Omega | \frac{\partial^r f}{\partial z_{j_1} \cdots \partial z_{j_r}}(w) \neq 0\}, 1 \leq j_k \leq d, 1 \leq k \leq r.$$

Repeating the above argument and by induction, we have that $h$ extends analytically to

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \Lambda_j \cup (\Omega - E).$$

By induction, $h$ extends analytically to

$$(\Omega - E) \bigcup [\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \Lambda_j] \bigcup [\bigcup_{1 \leq j,k \leq d} \Lambda_{j,k}] \bigcup \cdots$$

To finish the proof, we will show that the union is exactly $\Omega$, and thus $h$ extends analytically to $\Omega$, forcing

$$h \in L^2_a(\Omega).$$

For a point $w_0$ in the complement of

$$(\Omega - E) \bigcup [\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \Lambda_j] \bigcup [\bigcup_{1 \leq j,k \leq d} \Lambda_{j,k}] \bigcup \cdots,$$

we have

$$\frac{\partial^r f}{\partial z_{j_1} \cdots \partial z_{j_r}}(w_0) = 0, 1 \leq j_1, \cdots, j_r \leq d.$$

Taylor's expansion of $f$ gives that $f$ is identically zero on a neighborhood of $w_0$ and hence $f \equiv 0$ on $\Omega$, which contradicts that $f$ is nonconstant on $\Omega$. Thus this implies that

$$(\Omega - E) \bigcup [\bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \Lambda_j] \bigcup [\bigcup_{1 \leq j,k \leq d} \Lambda_{j,k}] \bigcup \cdots$$

is equal $\Omega$. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1. □

A relatively closed set $A$ of $\Omega$ is called *locally $L^2_a$-removable* in $\Omega$ if for each $\lambda$ in $\Omega$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is an open domain $U$ such that $U$ is contained in the ball centered at $\lambda$ with radius $\varepsilon$ and $U \cap A$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $U$. By Theorem 3.1 a zero variety is also locally $L^2_a$-removable. Furthermore, a proper subvariety is locally contained in a zero variety, and thus a proper subvariety is locally $L^2_a$-removable and $L^2_a$-removable, see [3, Removable singularity theorem]. For simplicity, we say that a closed subset $J$ of $\mathbb{C}^d$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable if for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^d$, there is a domain $\Omega$ containing $\lambda$ such that the set $J \cap \Omega$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$.

In the proof of Theorem 1.3, we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a closed and locally $L^2_a$-removable set in $\mathbb{C}^d$ with Lebesgue measure zero. Suppose $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that the image of $F$ has an interior point. Then $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable and $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$.*

*Proof.* Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a closed and locally $L^2_a$-removable set in $\mathbb{C}^d$ with Lebesgue measure zero. Suppose $F$ satisfies the assumption in Lemma 3.2. Then $JF$ does not equal identically zero, and we will see that $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E})$ is of Lebesgue measure zero. In fact,

$$F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq Z(JF) \bigcup \{z \in \Omega : JF(z) \neq 0 \text{ and } F(z) \in \mathcal{E}\}.$$

Since $\{z \in \Omega : JF(z) \neq 0 \text{ and } F(z) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ is contained in a union of countably many biholomorphic images of subsets in $\mathcal{E}$, it must have Lebesgue measure zero. Also, note that a zero variety $Z(JF)$ has Lebesgue measure zero. Hence $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E})$ is of Lebesgue measure zero.

Let $\Omega'$ be an open subdomain in $\Omega$. We will show that $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \cap \Omega'$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega'$. To do this, we note that for each $\lambda \in \Omega$, if $JF(\lambda) \neq 0$, then there is an open neighborhood $U(\lambda)$ of $\lambda$ such that $F$ is biholomorphic on a neighborhood of $\overline{U(\lambda)}$. Since

$$F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \cap U(\lambda) = \{z \in U(\lambda) | F(z) \in \mathcal{E}\} = (F|_{U(\lambda)})^{-1}(\mathcal{E}),$$

and $\mathcal{E}$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable, $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \cap U(\lambda)$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $U(\lambda)$. This implies that for each $h \in L^2_a(\Omega' - F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}))$, $h$ extends analytically to the union of all $U(\lambda)$, and hence $h$ extends analytically to $\Omega' \cap \{z : JF(z) \neq 0\}$. That is, $h$ extends analytically to $\Omega' - Z(JF)$, where $Z(JF)$ denotes the zero set of $JF$. Since $h \in L^2_a(\Omega' - F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}))$ and $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E})$ is of Lebesgue measure zero, $h$ is in $L^2_a(\Omega' - Z(JF))$. By Theorem 3.1, a zero variety is $L^2_a$-removable, $h$ extends analytically to $\Omega'$ and hence $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E}) \cap \Omega'$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega'$. This implies that $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$. In particular, $F^{-1}(\mathcal{E})$ is $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$. □

Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Let $E$ be a good zero variety of a domain $\Omega$, and $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that the image of $F$ has an interior point. We will first prove that $F(\overline{E})$ is contained in a union of finitely many sets $\Psi(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1} \times \{0\})$ for some functions $\Psi(\cdot, 0)$ holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1}$. In fact, in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we consider the following sets:

$$\{z : f(z) = 0\},$$

where $f$ is a locally holomorphic function satisfying $\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j} \neq 0$ for some integer $j$ $(1 \leq j \leq d)$. Without loss of generality we assume $j = d$. Then there is a point $\lambda$ such that

$$f(\lambda) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_d}(\lambda) \neq 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Then there exists a neighborhood $U_\lambda$ of $\lambda$ such that $(z_1, \cdots, z_{d-1}, f)$ is biholomorphic over $U_\lambda$. Hence, up to a biholomorphic transformation $U_\lambda \cap E$ can be regarded as $\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$ (if necessary, $U_\lambda$ can be replaced with a smaller domain containing $\lambda$).

In general, for each $w \in \overline{E}$, there must be a multi-index $\beta$ satisfying

$$\frac{\partial^\beta f}{\partial z^\beta}(w) \neq 0.$$

Then by induction, there is a multi-index $\alpha$ related with $\beta$ so that a similar version of (3.1) holds:

$$\frac{\partial^\alpha f}{\partial z^\alpha}(w) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\frac{\partial^\alpha f}{\partial z^\alpha}(w) \neq 0$$

for some integer $j(1 \leq j \leq d)$. Let

$$h_w = \frac{\partial^\alpha f}{\partial z^\alpha},$$

and we have $\frac{\partial h_w}{\partial z_j}(w) \neq 0$. Repeating the above argument gives that there is a neighborhood $V_w$ of $w$ such that $V_w \cap E$ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. Since $E$ is good, the above discussion also holds for $\overline{E}$. Thus $\overline{E}$ is covered by these $V_\lambda$ where $\lambda \in \overline{E}$ and so $\overline{E}$ is covered by finitely many sets $V_\lambda \cap \overline{E}$ since $\overline{E}$ is compact. Hence $\overline{E}$ is contained in a union of finitely many (distinct) biholomorphic images of $\mathbb{D}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. Furthermore, we require these corresponding biholomorphic maps to be biholomorphic on a neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1} \times \{0\}$. Therefore, $F(\overline{E})$ is contained in a union of finitely many sets $\Psi(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1} \times \{0\})$, where $\Psi(\cdot, 0)$ are holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1}$.

Next we will show the following statement:

*For $n = 1, \cdots, d-1$, $G : \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n$. Then $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n)$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable.*

To do this, we will use induction on $n$. For $n = 1$, there exist $d$ holomorphic functions $g_1, \cdots, g_d$ on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ such that

$$G(z_1) = (g_1(z_1), \cdots, g_d(z_1)),\ z_1 \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Without loss of generality, assume that both $G$ and $g_1$ are not constant. Let

$$Z_0 = \{t \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} : g_1'(t) = 0\},$$

and

$$\widetilde{Z_0} = \{t \in \overline{\mathbb{D}} : g_1(t) \in g_1(Z_0)\}.$$

For each $t \notin \widetilde{Z_0}$, there are exactly finitely many points $t_1, \cdots, t_k \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and domains $V$ and $U_1, \cdots, U_k$ such that $V \cap g_1(Z_0) = \emptyset$,

$$g_1^{-1}(V) = \bigsqcup_{1 \leq m \leq k} U_m,$$

and all maps

$$g_1 : U_m \to V,\ 1 \leq m \leq k,$$

are biholomorphic. For $1 \leq m \leq k$, on each $U_m$ the complex variable $z_1$ can be written as a function of $g_1$, and so does the functions $g_2, \cdots, g_d$. Write

$$g_j(z_1) = \widetilde{f_j^{(m)}}(g_1(z_1)), z_1 \in U_m, 1 \leq m \leq k, 2 \leq j \leq d.$$

Then $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \cap \left(V \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1}\right)$ is contained in

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq m \leq k} \{(w_1, \cdots, w_d) : w_1 \in V, w_j = \widetilde{f_j^{(m)}}(w_1),\ 2 \leq j \leq d\},$$

and the latter is a union of finitely many zero varieties. Hence $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \cap \left(V \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1}\right)$ is a relatively closed subset of a zero variety. Thus by Theorem 3.1 $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}) \cap \left(V \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1}\right)$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable and so $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\left(\mathbb{C} - f(Z_0)\right) \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$. Since $f(Z_0) \times \mathbb{C}^{d-1}$ is a union of finitely many zero varieties in $\mathbb{C}^d$, this gives that $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\mathbb{C}^d$.

If $d = 2$, then the proof is complete. We may assume that $d > 2$. Suppose the above statement holds for $n - 1\,(1 < n \leq d - 1)$. Let $k^*$ denote the maximal rank of the Jacobian matrix of $G$. Write

$$G(z) = (g_1(z), \cdots, g_d(z)), z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n.$$

We have

$$k^* \leq n \leq d - 1.$$

Without loss of generality, assume $k^* \geq 1$ and the determinant of the Jacobian matrix $(g_1, \cdots, g_{k^*})$ with respect to $z_1, \cdots, z_{k^*}$ is not identically zero on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n$, and denote the determinant by $\varphi$. Note that $\varphi$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n$ and put

$$\overline{Z} = \{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n : \varphi(z) = 0\}.$$

First we will show that $G(\overline{Z})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. To do this, we note that $\overline{Z}$ is the closure of a good zero variety in $\mathbb{D}^n$. By the first paragraph of proof of Theorem 1.3, $G(\overline{Z})$ is contained in a union of finitely many holomorphic images of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{n-1}$. By induction each of such holomorphic image of $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{n-1}$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. Since a union of finitely many locally $L^2_a$-removable sets with zero measure is also locally $L^2_a$-removable, and a closed subset of a locally $L^2_a$-removable set is also locally $L^2_a$-removable, we have that $G(\overline{Z})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable.

Next we will show that for $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n - G^{-1}(G(\overline{Z}))$, there is an enough small neighborhood $W_z$ of $z$ so that $G(W_z)$ is a zero variety. To do this, we choose $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n - G^{-1}(G(\overline{Z}))$. Thus $G(z)$ is not in $G(\overline{Z})$ and $\varphi(z) \neq 0$. So there is a connected neighborhood $W_z$ of $z$ satisfying

$$\varphi|_{W_z} \neq 0.$$

On $W_z$ the Jacobian matrix of $G$ is of constant rank $k^*$. We will use a complex version of constant rank theorem ([7, p. 69], [28, p.53]). Precisely, let $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and $\Phi$ be holomorphic on a neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $p$ such that $\Phi(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^d$. If the Jacobian matrix of $\Phi$ is of constant rank $k$ on $\mathcal{O}$, then there are open domains $W_1$ and $W_2$ with $\Phi(W_1) \subseteq W_2$ and biholomorphic functions $\phi$ on $W_1$ and $\psi$ on $W_2$ such that $\widehat{\Phi} = \psi \circ \Phi \circ \phi^{-1}$ is defined by

$$\widehat{\Phi}(z_1, \cdots, z_n) = (z_1, \cdots, z_k, 0, \cdots, 0),$$

and $\phi(p) = (0, \cdots, 0)$ and $\psi(\Phi(p)) = (0, \cdots, 0)$. In particular, $\Phi(W_1)$ is a zero variety if $k < d$. In the case discussed above, $k = k^* < d$. Thus we can require that $W_z$ is enough small so that $G(W_z)$ is a zero variety for each $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n - G^{-1}(G(\overline{Z}))$.

For each $\varepsilon > 0$, take an $\varepsilon$-neighborhood $V(\varepsilon)$ of $G(\overline{Z})$. Write

$$\mathcal{K} = G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n) - V(\varepsilon),$$

and

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{K}} = \{z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}^n : G(z) \in \mathcal{K}\}.$$

Then both $\mathcal{K}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ are compact sets. For each $z$ in $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$, $G(z) \notin V(\varepsilon)$, and hence

$$G(z) \notin G(\overline{Z}).$$

Then by above discussion, there is a neighborhood $W_z$ of $z$ such that $G(W_z)$ is a zero variety of some domain. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ is covered by all these $W_z$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ is compact, $\widetilde{\mathcal{K}}$ is covered by finitely many such sets $W_z$. Since $\mathcal{K} = G(\widetilde{\mathcal{K}})$, $\mathcal{K}$ is covered by finitely many of $G(W_z)$. This gives that $\mathcal{K}$ is locally contained in a union of finitely

many zero varieties and hence $\mathcal{K}$ is locally contained in a zero variety. By the comments below Theorem 3.1 $\mathcal{K}$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. Since

$$G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n) \cap \left(\mathbb{C}^d - \overline{V(\varepsilon)}\right) \subseteq \mathcal{K},$$

$G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n)$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\mathbb{C}^d - \overline{V(\varepsilon)}$. By arbitrariness of $\varepsilon$, $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n)$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\mathbb{C}^d - G(\overline{Z})$. Since $G(\overline{Z})$ is of Lebesgue measure zero and $G(\overline{Z})$ is also locally $L^2_a$-removable, it follows that $G(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^n)$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. This completes the proof of the above statement.

The above statement gives that for any function $\Psi$, if $\Psi(\cdot, 0)$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1}$, then $\Psi(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1} \times \{0\})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. Since we have shown that $F(\overline{E})$ is contained in a union of finitely many sets $\Psi(\overline{\mathbb{D}}^{d-1} \times \{0\})$ for some holomorphic functions $\Psi$, $F(\overline{E})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. Also, $F(\overline{E})$ is of Lebesuge measure zero. Then by Lemma 3.2, we have that $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable and $L^2_a$-removable to complete the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

Theorem 1.3 and its proof immediately give that if $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ and the image of $F$ has no interior point then $F(\overline{\Omega})$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$.

A simple version of Remmert's Proper Mapping theorem ([11, p. 65] or [30, 31]) says that if $f : \Omega' \to \Omega''$ is a holomorphic proper map and $\mathcal{Z}$ is a subvariety of $\Omega'$, then $f(\mathcal{Z})$ is a subvariety of $\Omega''$. Since a subvariety can be locally represented as the intersection of finitely many (locally-defined) zero varieties, $f(\mathcal{Z})$ is $L^2_a$-removable. We also have the following corollary of Theorem 3.1.

**Corollary 3.3.** *Suppose that $E$ is a zero variety of a domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$, and $F$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$. Then $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is relatively closed and $L^2_a$-removable in $\Omega$.*

*Proof.* Suppose that $E$ is a zero variety of a domain $\Omega$, and $F$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$. Note that by Remmert's Proper Mapping theorem $F(E)$ is a subvariety of $F(\Omega)$. Thus $F(E)$ is relatively closed and is locally contained in a zero variety, and so is $F^{-1}(F(E))$. By Theorem 3.1 $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is locally $L^2_a$-removable. Thus each function in $L^2_a(\Omega - F^{-1}(F(E)))$ extends analytically to $\Omega$. Noting that $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is of zero Lebesgue measure, we deduce that $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is $L^2_a$-removable to complete the proof. □

**Remark 3.4.** *Later in Sections 4 and 5, both $F^{-1}(F(E))$ and $F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$ will be discussed. If $F$ is a holomorphic proper map, $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is relatively closed in $\Omega$. If $F$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$, $F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$ is relatively closed in $\Omega$. If $F$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$ and $F$ is a proper map on $\Omega$, then*

$$F^{-1}(F(E)) = F^{-1}(F(\overline{E})).$$

It is known that if $E$ is a zero variety of a domain $\Omega$, then $\Omega - E$ is connected [33, Chapter 14]. The following result gives a slight generalization.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Suppose that $E$ is a zero variety of a domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$. Then we have the following:*

- *(i) if $E$ is good and $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ such that the image of $F$ has an interior point, then $\Omega - F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$ is connected.*
- *(ii) if $F$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$, then $\Omega - F^{-1}(F(E))$ is connected.*

*Proof.* We first deal with (i). Suppose that $E$ is a good zero variety of a domain $\Omega$, and $F : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a holomorphic map such that the image of $F$ has an interior point. By the proof of Theorem 1.3, $F(\overline{E})$ is contained in a union of finitely many sets that each is a holomorphic image of $\overline{\mathbb{D}^{d-1}} \times \{0\}$. Therefore, $F(\overline{E})$ can be represented as a union of finitely many compact sets $K'_n$ whose Hausdorff measures $h_{2d-2}(K'_n) < \infty$. Note that

$$F^{-1}(F(\overline{E})) \subseteq Z(JF) \bigcup \{z \in \Omega : JF(z) \neq 0, F(z) \in F(\overline{E})\}.$$

If $JF(\lambda) \neq 0$, then there is an open neighborhood $U(\lambda)$ of $\lambda$ such that $F$ is biholomorphic on $U(\lambda)$. Since $\{z \in \Omega : JF(z) \neq 0, F(z) \in F(\overline{E})\}$ can be written as a union of countably many sets $(F|_{U(\lambda)})^{-1}\big(F(\overline{E})\big)$, it can be represented as a union of countably many compact sets $K''_n$ whose Hausdorff measures $h_{2d-2}(K''_n) < \infty$. [33, Theorem 14.4.9] states that a zero variety of a domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$ can be represented as a union of countably compact sets $L_n$ whose Hausdorff measures $h_{2d-2}(L_n) < \infty$, and so is $F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$. By [33, Theorem 14.4.5], for a connected domain $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, if a relatively closed set $G$ can be written as the union of countably many compact sets $K_n$ whose Haudorff measure $h_t(K_n) < \infty$ for some $t \in (0, 2d-1)$, then $\mathcal{U} - G$ is connected. Therefore, $\Omega - F^{-1}(F(\overline{E}))$ is connected.

For (ii), Corollary 3.3 and its proof show that if $F$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$, then $F^{-1}(F(E))$ is relatively closed, and is locally contained in a zero variety. Then by the same discussion as above, $\Omega - F^{-1}(F(E))$ is connected. □

Proposition 3.5 fails if the assumption on $F$ is dropped. For example, put $\Omega_0 = \{z \in \mathbb{D} : |Re\, z| < \frac{1}{2}\}$, $E = \{z \in \Omega_0 \times \mathbb{D} : z_1 = z_2\}$ and

$$F(z_1, z_2) = (z_2, z_2).$$

Write $\Omega = \Omega_0 \times \mathbb{D}$, and then

$$\Omega - F^{-1}(F(\overline{E})) = \Omega_0 \times (\mathbb{D} - \Omega_0),$$

which is not connected.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.1. First we will show examples of some domains not satisfying property (1) or (2).

**Example 4.1.** *Let $K$ be a Cantor set in [0,1] with positive Lebesgue measure. Let $\Omega = (\mathbb{D} - K) \times \mathbb{D}$. Since $K \times \mathbb{D} \subseteq \partial\Omega$ and $K \times \mathbb{D}$ has positive Lebesgue measure in $\mathbb{C}^2$, then $\Omega$ does not satisfy (1). Also, each point $\zeta$ in $K \times \mathbb{D}$ does not satisfy the assumption (2).*

*In the complex plane, $\mathbb{D} - [0, 1]$ is a domain not satisfying (2).*

Let $\Phi$ denote $(\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_d)$, where each $\phi_j (1 \leq j \leq d)$ is a holomorphic function on $\Omega$. Let $Z$ denote the zeros of the determinant of the Jacobian $J\Phi$ of $\Phi$.

We also need the following notion, representing local inverse, which will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.1. If there is an operator $T$ in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ of the form:

$$Th(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j h(\rho_j(w))(J\rho_j)(w),\ h \in L^2_a(\Omega),\ w \in \Delta,$$

on an open domain $\Delta$ where $c_k \neq 0$ and all $\rho_j$ are local inverses of $\Phi$ on $\Delta$, then $\rho_k$ is called *a representing local inverse for* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ on $\Delta$ [37]. Later in Section 7 we will introduce the notion of a representing local inverse for $\{M_\Phi\}'$, which makes significant difference. Though in the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{D}$, they are just the same [36].

We are ready to present the proof of Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** Suppose that $\Omega$ satisfies Properties (1) and (2) in introduction, $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$ and the image of $\Phi$ has an interior point. First we show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is of finite dimension. Since the image of $\Phi$ has an interior point the complex dimension of $\Phi(\Omega)$ would be $d$. This gives that $J\Phi \not\equiv 0$. Recall that

$$Z = \{z \in \Omega |\, J\Phi(z) = 0\},$$

and $\Phi(\overline{Z})$ is a closed set of Lebesgue measure zero. For each $\lambda \in \Omega - \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$ there exists a ball $\Delta$ ($\Delta \subseteq \Omega$) centered at $\lambda$ satisfying

$$\Phi(\overline{\Delta}) \cap \Phi(\overline{Z}) = \emptyset,$$

and $\Phi|_\Delta$ is biholomorphic. Therefore, for each $w \in \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{\Delta})) \cap \overline{\Omega}$, $J\Phi(w) \neq 0$, and there is an open ball $U_w$ of $w$ such that $\Phi : U_w \to \Phi(U_w)$ is biholomorphic. Note that $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{\Delta})) \cap \overline{\Omega}$ is compact, and the union of all such balls $U_w$ covers $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{\Delta})) \cap \overline{\Omega}$. Then by Henie-Borel's theorem, one can pick finite from them: $U_1, \cdots, U_n$ such that

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{n} U_j \supseteq \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{\Delta})) \cap \Omega.$$

and $\Phi|_{U_j}$ is biholomorphic for each $j$. Since $\Phi$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$, $\Phi$ is holomorphic on a domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ such that $\widetilde{\Omega} \supseteq \overline{\Omega}$. Writing

$$U_j' = U_j \cap \widetilde{\Omega} \cap \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\Delta)),\ j = 1, \cdots, K,$$

we still have

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^{n} U_j' \supseteq \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\Delta)) \cap \Omega. \tag{4.1}$$

Since $\Phi|_{U_j'}$ are all biholomorphic, $\Phi(\lambda)$ is attained by $\Phi$ in $U_j'$ at most once. Then by shrinking $\Delta$, (4.1) shows that there are finitely many disjoint domains $\Delta_1, \cdots, \Delta_N$ and biholomorphic maps $\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_N$ such that

$$\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{N} \Delta_j = \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\Delta)) \cap \Omega$$

and

$$\rho_j(\Delta_1) = \Delta_j \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \circ \rho_j = \Phi,\ 1 \leq j \leq N,$$

where $\rho_1(z) \equiv z$ and $\Delta_1 = \Delta$. Again by shrinking $\Delta$, we may require all these $U_j'$ have no intersection with $\partial\Omega$. In fact, by the assumption (2) we may replace $\Delta$ with an open subset of $\Delta$ to make sure that $U_1'$ have no intersection with $\partial\Omega$. Note that $U_2', \cdots, U_n'$ will shrink automatically. By shrinking $\Delta$ again, $U_2'$ has no intersection with $\partial\Omega$. After finite steps, all $U_j'$ have no intersection with $\partial\Omega$ : some of them become smaller, and some of them vanish. Besides, it is worthwhile to emphasize that if

$$\Phi^{-1}(\Phi)(\lambda) \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset,$$

then $\Delta$ can be replaced with a smaller ball centered at $\lambda$.

Next we will give the representation of those operators in the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi)$ and the idea comes from [21]. To do this, let $S$ be a unitary operator in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi)$. Given any function $g$ and $h$ in $L^2_a(\Omega)$, let

$$\widetilde{g} = Sg \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{h} = Sh.$$

Then for any multivariate polynomials $P$ and $Q$,

$$\langle P(\Phi)g, Q(\Phi)h\rangle = \langle P(\Phi)\widetilde{g}, Q(\Phi)\widetilde{h}\rangle.$$

That is,

$$\int_\Omega \Big((P\overline{Q})\circ\Phi(w)g(w)\overline{h}(w) - (P\overline{Q})\circ\Phi(w)\widetilde{g(w)}\overline{\widetilde{h(w)}}\Big)dA(w) = 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Now let

$$\mathcal{X} = span\,\{p\overline{q} : \ p, q \text{ are polynomials in } d \text{ variables}\}.$$

By the Stone-Weierstrass Theorem, each continuous function on $\overline{\Phi(\Omega)}$ can be uniformly approximated by members in $\mathcal{X}$. Thus by (4.2)

$$\int_\Omega \Big(u(\Phi(w))g(w)\overline{h}(w) - u(\Phi(w))\widetilde{g(w)}\overline{\widetilde{h(w)}}\Big)dA(w) = 0, u \in C(\overline{\Phi(\Omega)}). \tag{4.3}$$

By Lebesgue's Dominated Convergence Theorem, (4.3) holds for all $u$ in $L^\infty(\Phi(\Omega))$. Let $\Delta$ denote the ball in the above paragraph. For each $u$ in $L^\infty(\Phi(\Delta))$, (4.3) gives that

$$\int_{\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\Delta))} u(\Phi(w))g(w)\overline{h}(w)dA(w) = \int_{\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\Delta))} u(\Phi(w))\widetilde{g(w)}\overline{\widetilde{h(w)}}dA(w),$$

and hence by requirements on $\Delta$ below (4.1),

$$\int_\Delta u(\Phi(z))\sum_{j=1}^N (g\overline{h})\circ\rho_j(z)|(J\rho_j)(z)|^2dA(z) = \int_\Delta u(\Phi(z))\sum_{j=1}^N (\widetilde{g}\overline{\widetilde{h}})\circ\rho_j(z)|(J\rho_j)(z)|^2dA(z).$$

Noting that $\Phi$ is univalent on $\Delta$ and $u$ can be an arbitrary function in $L^\infty(\Phi(\Delta))$, we immediately have

$$\sum_{j=1}^N (g\overline{h})\circ\rho_j(z)|(J\rho_j)(z)|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^N (\widetilde{g}\overline{\widetilde{h}})\circ\rho_j(z)|(J\rho_j)(z)|^2, \quad z \in \Delta. \tag{4.4}$$

In fact, we get that (4.4) holds almost everywhere on $\Delta$ first, and then by continuity (4.4) holds on $\Delta$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the Bergman space over $\Delta$. Set

$$e_g^j = g(\rho_j(z))(J\rho_j)(z) \quad \text{and} \quad f_g^j = \widetilde{g}(\rho_j(z))(J\rho_j)(z), 1 \le j \le N, \, g \in L^2_a(\Omega).$$

All $e_g^j$ and $f_g^j$ lie in $\mathcal{H}$. By (4.4), the Berezin transforms of $\sum_{j=1}^N e_g^k \otimes e_h^k$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N f_g^k \otimes f_h^k$ are equal. By the property of the Berezin transform,

$$\sum_{k=1}^N e_g^k \otimes e_h^k = \sum_{k=1}^N f_g^k \otimes f_h^k, \ g, h \in L^2_a(\Omega).$$

Then applying Lemma 2.3 gives that there is an $N \times N$ unitary numerical matrix $W$ such that

$$W\begin{pmatrix} g(\rho_1(w))J\rho_1(w) \\ \vdots \\ g(\rho_N(w))J\rho_N(w) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{g}(\rho_1(w))J\rho_1(w) \\ \vdots \\ \widetilde{g}(\rho_N(w))J\rho_N(w) \end{pmatrix}, \ w \in \Delta,$$

By expanding the first raw of $W$, we get $N$ constants $c_1, \cdots, c_N$ such that

$$\widetilde{g}(\rho_1(w))J\rho_1(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j g(\rho_j(w))(J\rho_j)(w).$$

Noting $\rho_1(w) \equiv w$,

$$Sg(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j g(\rho_j(w))(J\rho_j)(w),\ w \in \Delta. \tag{4.5}$$

Since each operator in a von Neumann algebra is the linear span of finitely many unitary operators, for any $S$ in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi)$, $S$ has the same form as (4.5). Note that all such vectors $(c_1, \cdots, c_N)$ span a linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^N$ with dimension not larger than $N$ and $S$ is uniquely determined by the formula (4.5) on $\Delta$. Therefore,

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega) \leq N.$$

Next we will find the finitely many generators of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. By Proposition 3.5 $\Omega - \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$ is connected. Note that $\Phi$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$, and then $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$ is relatively closed in $\Omega$. Thus

$$\Omega - \overline{\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(Z))} = \Omega - \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z})).$$

Recall that a local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is called *admissible* if for each curve $\gamma$ in $\Omega - \overline{\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(Z))}$, $\rho$ admits analytic continuation with values in $\Omega$. Next we will show that if $\rho$ is a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, then $\rho$ is admissible.

To do this, assume that $\rho$ is a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. Letting

$$A_0 = \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z})),$$

we will see that $\rho$ is admissible with respect to $A_0$. In fact, applying Proposition 3.5 shows that $\Omega - A_0$ is connected. Since $\rho$ is a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, there are an operator $S$ in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ and an open ball $\Delta$ such that

$$Sg(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j g(\rho_j(w))(J\rho_j)(w),\ w \in \Delta, g \in L^2_a(\Omega), \tag{4.6}$$

where $\rho_{j_0} = \rho$ for some integer $j_0$ and all $c_j \neq 0$. This can be reformulated as

$$S^* K_w = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \overline{c_j}\overline{(J\rho_j)(w)} K_{\rho_j(w)},\ w \in \Delta,$$

where $K_w$ denotes the reproducing kernel of $L^2_a(\Omega)$ at $w \in \Omega$. For each point $\lambda \in \Omega - A_0$, there is an open ball $\Delta_\lambda$ containing $\lambda$ where a similar representation as (4.6) for $S$ holds. Thus, by similar discussion as above we get

$$S^* K_w = \sum_{j=1}^{N_\lambda} \overline{c_j^\lambda}\,\overline{(J\rho_j^\lambda)(w)} K_{\rho_j^\lambda(w)},\ w \in \Delta_\lambda. \tag{4.7}$$

Let $\gamma$ be an arbitrary curve in $\Omega - A_0$ and $\gamma(0) \in \Delta$. Since the union of all these open balls $\Delta_\lambda$ covers $\gamma$, applying Henie-Borel's theorem shows that there exist finitely many such balls whose union covers $\gamma$. If the intersection of two such balls is not empty, then by the uniqueness of the representations (4.7) we get direct

continuations of the tuple $\{\rho_j^\lambda : 1 \le j \le N\}$ and all $N_\lambda$ are equal. Then it follows that $\rho$ admits analytic continuation along $\gamma$. Furthermore,

$$c_j^\lambda \neq 0,\ 1 \le j \le N_\lambda,$$

as we showed before, we have that for these $j$ the images $\rho_j^\lambda(\Delta_\lambda)$ of $\rho_j^\lambda$ lie in $\Omega$. Hence the images of $\rho$ and its continuations lie in $\Omega$. Therefore, by arbitrariness of $\gamma$, $\rho$ is admissible with respect to $A_0$. Thus, a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is admissible.

For each point in $\Omega - A_0$, there is a neighborhood where all members in $[\rho]$ are holomorphic. As $\Omega - A_0$ is connected, if $\rho$ is a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, then the number $k([\rho])$ of different members in $[\rho]$ (defined on a same domain $\Delta$) does not depend on the choice of the domain $\Delta$. In this sense, we denote this integer $k([\rho])$ by $\sharp[\rho]$, called *the multiplicity* of $[\rho]$ [23]. Now fix a representing local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$. As done in [20] or [23], define

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h(w) = \sum_{\sigma \in [\rho]} h \circ \sigma(w)\, J\sigma(w),\ w \in \Omega - A_0, \tag{4.8}$$

where $h$ is an arbitrary function over $\Omega - A_0$ or $\Omega$. In the case of $\Phi$ being holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$, the right hand side of (4.8) is a finite sum. Also by the above paragraph $\sigma(z) \in \Omega - A_0$ if $z \in \Omega - A_0$ and $\sigma \in [\rho]$. Then the formula (4.8) makes sense. In the sequel, for a local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$, $\rho^-$ always denotes the inverse of $\rho$.

Next, we will prove that if $\rho$ is admissible, then both $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$ are in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, and $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}^* = \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$. Also, one will see that if $\rho$ is admissible, $\rho$ is representing for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. In fact, the proof of the theorem in [36, p. 526] shows that the class of all admissible local inverses of $\Phi$ is closed under composition; if $\rho$ is an admissible local inverse, then its inverse $\rho^-$ is also admissible. Suppose that $\rho$ is an admissible local inverse of $\Phi$ with respect to $A_0$, defined as above. We will apply the proof of [23, Lemma 6.3] to show that $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ maps each function in $L_a^2(\Omega)$ to a function in $L_a^2(\Omega - A)$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $C$ satisfying

$$\|\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}g\| \le C\|g\|,\ g \in L_a^2(\Omega).$$

To do this, let $h \in C_c(\Omega - A)$; that is, $h$ is a continuous function over $\Omega - A_0$ with compact support. Let

$$l = \sharp[\rho] \quad \text{and} \quad l' = \sharp[\rho^-].$$

Note that there are only finitely many admissible local inverses. For each enough small open set $U$, there exists $l$ admissible local inverse $\{\rho_j\}_{j=1}^l$ on $U$ with each in $[\rho]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_U |\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h(z)|^2 dA(z) &\le C \int_U \sum_{j=1}^{l} |h \circ \rho_j(z)|^2 |J\rho_j(z)|^2 dA(z) \\ &= C \sum_{j=1}^{l} \int_{\rho_j(U)} |h(z)|^2 dA(z), \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

where $C$ is a numerical constant. Note that each point in $\Omega - A_0$ has a neighborhood where each member in $[\rho]$ is holomorphic. There exists an open covering $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$

of $\Omega - A_0$ such that each member in $[\rho]$ is holomorphic on $U_k$ for all $U_k$. Let

$$E_1 = U_1 \quad \text{and} \quad E_k = U_k - \bigcup_{1\le j<k} U_j \, (k \ge 2).$$

Then $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is a measurable covering of $\Omega - A_0$ with similar property as $\{U_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, and (4.9) also holds if $U$ is replaced with $E_k$. Since each point in the union of $\rho_j(E_k)(1 \le j \le l,\, 1 \le k < \infty)$ is attained by $l'$ times by $\{\rho_j(E_k)\}$,

$$\int_\Omega |\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h(z)|^2 dA(z) \le C\sum_{j=1}^{l}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\int_{\rho_j(E_k)} |h(z)|^2 dA(z) \le Cl'\|h\|^2, h \in L_a^2(\Omega).$$

That is, $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]} : L_a^2(\Omega) \to L_a^2(\Omega - A_0)$ is a bounded operator. Theorem 1.3 gives that each member in $L_a^2(\Omega - A_0)$ extends analytically to one in $L_a^2(\Omega)$, and thus $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ defines a bounded linear operator from $L_a^2(\Omega)$ to $L_a^2(\Omega)$. Similarly we can show that $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$ is also a bounded operator from $L_a^2(\Omega)$ to $L_a^2(\Omega)$. Furthermore, using the similar argument in the proof of [23, Lemma 6.3] we will show

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}^* = \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}. \tag{4.10}$$

Now let $U$ be a fixed open subset of $\Omega - A_0$ where all admissible local inverses of $\Phi$ are holomorphic, and $h$ be a bounded measurable function whose support is contained in $\rho_{i_0}(U)$ for some $i_0$, and $g \in C_c(\Omega - A_0)$. Since $l' = \sharp[\rho^-]$, then we may write

$$[\rho^-]\rho_{i_0}(U) = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{l'} \check{\rho_j}(U), \tag{4.11}$$

where $\check{\rho_j}$ are local inverses of $\Phi$ on $U$. Then for each $j(1 \le j \le l')$, there is an admissible local inverse $\sigma_j : \check{\rho_j}(U) \to \rho_{i_0}(U)$ and $\sigma_j$ is onto. Since $\sigma_j \in [\rho]$ and $h$ is supported on $\rho_{i_0}(U)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\check{\rho_j}(U)} \sum_{\rho_k\in[\rho]} h\circ\rho_k(z)J\rho_k(z)\overline{g(z)}dA(z) &= \int_{\check{\rho_j}(U)} h\circ\sigma_j(z)J\sigma_j(z)\overline{g(z)}dA(z)\\ &= \int_{\rho_{i_0}(U)} h\circ\sigma_j(\sigma_j^-(w))J\sigma_j(\sigma_j^-(w))|J\sigma_j^-(w)|^2\overline{g(\sigma_j^-(w))}dA(w)\\ &= \int_{\rho_{i_0}(U)} h(w)\overline{g(\sigma_j^-(w))J\sigma_j^-(w)}dA(w)\end{aligned}$$

to get

$$\int_{\check{\rho_j}(U)} \sum_{\rho_k\in[\rho]} h\circ\rho_k(z)J\rho_k(z)\overline{g(z)}dA(z) = \int_{\rho_{i_0}(U)} h(w)\overline{g(\sigma_j^-(w))J\sigma_j^-(w)}dA(w).$$

Noting that $h$ is supported in $\rho_{i_0}(U)$, by (4.11) we obtain that

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h = \sum_{\rho_s\in[\rho]}\sum_{j=1}^{l'} \chi_{\check{\rho_j}(U)} h\circ\rho_s J\rho_s.$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h, g\rangle &= \sum_{j=1}^{l'}\int_{\rho_j(U)}\sum_{\rho_s\in[\rho]} h\circ\rho_s(z)J\rho_s(z)\overline{g(z)}dA(z)\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{l'}\int_{\rho_{i_0}(U)} h(w)\overline{g(\sigma_j^-(w))J\sigma_j^-(w)}dA(w).\\ &= \int_\Omega h(w)\chi_{\rho_{i_0}(U)}\overline{\sum_{\sigma\in[\rho^-]} g(\sigma(w))J\sigma'(w)}dA(w)\\ &= \langle h, \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}g\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

That is,

$$\langle \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h, g\rangle = \langle h, \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}g\rangle.$$

Since each compact subset of $\Omega - A_0$ is contained in the union of finitely many open sets like $\rho_{i_0}(U)$, the above identity also holds for any $h \in C_c(\Omega - A_0)$. Using a limit argument, we will show that the above identity holds if we replace $g$ and $h$ with members in $L^2_a(\Omega)$. To do this, first we can find a sequence $\{K_n\}$ of compact subsets of $\Omega - A_0$ and a sequence of continuous functions $\{u_n\}$ over $\Omega$ such that

(1) the union of all $K_n$ equals $\Omega - A_0$, and the interior of $E_{n+1}$ contains $K_n$ for each $n$ (for example, write $K_n = \{z \in \Omega - A_0 : d(z, \partial(\Omega - A_0)) \le \frac{1}{n}\}$);
(2) $0 \le u_n \le 1$, $u_n|_{K_n} = 1$, and $u_n|_{\Omega - E_{n+1}} = 0$.

In this case, for $g$ and $h$ in $L^2_a(\Omega)$, both $g\sqrt{u_n}$ and $h\sqrt{u_n}$ lie in $C_c(\Omega - A_0)$. Then

$$\langle\, \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}(h\sqrt{u_n}), g\sqrt{u_n}\,\rangle = \langle\, h\sqrt{u_n}, \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}(g\sqrt{u_n})\,\rangle.$$

Noting that the Lebesgue measure of $A_0$ is zero, we have

$$\int_\Omega \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}(h\sqrt{u_n})\overline{g\sqrt{u_n}}dA(z) = \int_\Omega h\sqrt{u_n}\overline{\mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}(g\sqrt{u_n})}dA(z),\ n \ge 1.$$

Since the integrand functions in left and right hand sides are dominated by $|g|\,\mathcal{E}_{|[\rho]|}|h|$ and $|h|\,\mathcal{E}_{|[\rho]|}|g|$ (both in $L^1(\Omega)$), respectively as

$$\mathcal{E}_{|[\rho]|}f(w) = \sum_{\sigma\in[\rho]} f\circ\sigma(w)\,|J\sigma(w)|,\ w \in \Omega - A_0,$$

by applying Lebesgue's Dominating Theorem, we have

$$\langle \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}h, g\rangle = \langle h, \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}g\rangle, g, h \in L^2_a(\Omega),$$

to get

$$\mathcal{E}^*_{[\rho]} = \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}.$$

Since both $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$ commute with $M_{\Phi,\Omega} = \{M_{\phi_j,\Omega} : 1 \le j \le d\}$, they are in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. This shows that $\rho$ is a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. Thus, all admissible local inverses are representing for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$.

Next we will derive a delicate form of (4.5). If $S$ is in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi)$, then it has the form as (4.5)

$$Sg(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j g(\rho_j(w))(J\rho_j)(w),\ w \in \Delta,\ g \in L^2_a(\Omega),$$

where $\Delta$ is a subdomain of $\Omega$. By applying techniques of analytic continuation, if $\rho_k$ and $\rho_l$ lie in the same equivalent class, then their coefficients are equal [20]; that

is, $c_k = c_l$. To do this, let $\rho_l$ be the analytic continuation of $\rho_k$ along a loop $\gamma$, and for each $\rho_j$ let $\widetilde{\rho_j}$ denote the analytic continuation of $\rho_j$ along $\gamma$. Then we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j g(\rho_j(w))(J\rho_j)(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j g(\widetilde{\rho_j}(w))(J\widetilde{\rho_j})(w),\ w \in \Delta,\ g \in L^2_a(\Omega).$$

By the uniqueness of coefficients $c_j$ in the above formula and noting $\widetilde{\widetilde{\rho_k}} = \rho_l$ we have $c_k = c_l$, as desired. By arbitrariness of $\Delta$, we can rewrite $S$ as

$$Sg(w) = \sum_{\rho} c_\rho \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]} g(w),\ w \in \Omega - A_0,\ g \in L^2_a(\Omega). \tag{4.12}$$

This gives that each operator $S$ in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ can be represented as a linear span of $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, where $\rho$ are representing local inverses for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. Also, we have shown that those $\rho$ are exactly admissible local inverses of $\Phi$, and each $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ is a well-defined bounded operator in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

Recall that for a local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$, $\rho^-$ denotes the inverse of $\rho$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 gives the following result.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose both $\Omega$ and $\Phi$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Then $\rho$ is a representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ if and only if $\rho$ is admissible. In this case, both $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$ are in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, and $\mathcal{E}^*_{[\rho]} = \mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$.*

In particular, $\rho$ is admissible if and only if $\rho^-$ is admissible.

From the proof of Theorem 1.1, we see that if $\rho$ is a local inverse of $\Phi$ and

$$\rho(\Delta) \cap \Omega = \emptyset,$$

where $\Delta$ is a subdomain of $\Omega$, then $\rho$ does not appear in the representation (4.5). That is, $\rho$ is not admissible. Furthermore, since $\rho(\Delta)$ is a domain, if $\rho(\Delta) \cap \partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$, then by property (2) of $\Omega$ (see introduction) we can shrink $\Delta$ such that $\rho(\Delta) \cap \Omega = \emptyset$. Then $\rho$ does not appear in (4.5) and $\rho$ is not admissible. The same is true for analytic continuations of $\rho$.

Besides, we immediately have the following corollaries .

**Corollary 4.3.** *Suppose both $\Omega$ and $\Phi$ satisfy the assumptions in Theorem 1.1. Then the dimension of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ equals the number of equivalent classes of admissible local inverses of $\Phi$ on $\Omega$ .*

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let $\Omega$ be a domain satisfying the properties (1) and (2). For $n$ ($n \geq d$) holomorphic functions $\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_n$ on $\overline{\Omega}$, if there are $d$ members $\phi_{i_1}, \cdots, \phi_{i_d}$ among them such that*

$$J(\phi_{i_1}, \cdots, \phi_{i_d}) \not\equiv 0$$

*on $\Omega$, then $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_n, \Omega)$ is of finite dimension.*

On the other hand, Theorem 1.1 may fail if the assumption on $\Phi$ is not satisfied.

**Example 4.5.** *Let $p(z_1, z_2) = z_1 z_2$ and $\Omega = \mathbb{B}_2$. Then $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(p, \mathbb{B}_2) = \infty$ since $M_p$ has infinitely many pairwise orthogonal reducing subspaces:*

$$\overline{span\,\{p^k z_1^n : k = 0, 1, \cdots\}},\ n \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

*Let $\Phi = (p^2, p^3)$. Thus the image $\Phi(\Omega)$ of $\Phi$ is contained in*

$$\{(z^2, z^3) : z \in \mathbb{D}\},$$

*and so $\Phi(\Omega)$ has no interior point. Since*

$$\mathcal{V}^*(p, \mathbb{B}_2) \subseteq \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2),$$

$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2) = \infty$.

However, for a single polynomial $q$ it may happen that $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(q, \Omega) < \infty$ and even $\mathcal{V}^*(q, \Omega) = \mathbb{C}I$. For instance, there exist abundant polynomails $q$ of degree one such that $\mathcal{V}^*(q, \mathbb{D}^d) = \mathbb{C}I$ for $d \geq 1$ [39, Theorem 5.1]. Also, it is shown that for positive integers $k$ and $l$, $2 \leq \dim \mathcal{V}^*(z^k + w^l, \mathbb{D}^d) < \infty$ [18, Theorem 1.1].

To end this section, we give more examples.

**Example 4.6.** *Given $k, l, k', l' \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let*

$$\Phi = (z_1^k z_2^l, z_1^{k'} z_2^{l'}),\ (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2.$$

*Note that the image of $\Phi$ contains an interior point if and only if $J\Phi \not\equiv 0$, if and only if*

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix} \neq 0.$$

*Assume*

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix} \neq 0.$$

*By Theorem 1.1 $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2) < \infty$. Furthermore, we claim that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is trivial if and only if*

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix} = \pm 1.$$

*To see this, assume without loss of generality*

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix} = 1.$$

*Then we have*

$$l'(k, l) - l(k', l') = (1, 0),$$

*and*

$$-k'(k, l) + k(k', l') = (0, 1).$$

*Given $(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ with $z_1 z_2 \neq 0$, let*

$$\Phi(w_1, w_2) = \Phi(z_1, z_2). \tag{4.13}$$

*Then the only solution $(w_1, w_2)$ for (4.13) is given by*

$$w_1 = \frac{(w_1^k w_2^l)^{l'}}{(w_1^{k'} w_2^{l'})^l} = \frac{(z_1^k z_2^l)^{l'}}{(z_1^{k'} z_2^{l'})^l} = z_1,$$

*and*

$$w_2 = \frac{(w_1^{k'} w_2^{l'})^k}{(w_1^k w_2^l)^{k'}} = \frac{(z_1^{k'} z_2^{l'})^k}{(z_1^k z_2^l)^{k'}} = z_2.$$

*That is, the only admissible local inverse for $\Phi$ is the identity map. Conversely, assume*

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix} \neq \pm 1.$$

*By computations, there is no integers $m_1, m_2, n_1$ and $n_2$ such that both of the following hold:*

$$m_1(k, l) + n_1(k', l') = (1, 0),$$

*and*

$$m_2(k,l)+n_2(k',l')=(0,1).$$

*Therefore,*

$$[\mathbb{Z}(k,l)+\mathbb{Z}(k',l')]\cap\mathbb{Z}_+^2\neq\mathbb{Z}_+^2.$$

*Let*

$$M=\overline{span\{z_1^{\alpha_1}z_2^{\alpha_2}:(\alpha_1,\alpha_2)\in\mathbb{Z}_+^2 \text{ and } (\alpha_1,\alpha_2)\in\mathbb{Z}(k,l)+\mathbb{Z}(k',l')\}}.$$

*It is easy to check that $M$ is a nonzero proper reducing subspace for $M_\Phi$. This implies that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\mathbb{D}^2)$ is nontrivial. In summary, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\mathbb{D}^2)$ is trivial if and only if*

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix}=\pm 1.$$

In Example 4.6, we assume

$$\begin{vmatrix} k & l \\ k' & l' \end{vmatrix}\neq 0.$$

Under this assumption we will see that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\mathbb{D}^2)$ is always abelian. In fact, letting $\Phi(w_1,w_2)=\Phi(z_1,z_2)$, by the techniques in Example 6.3 one can find positive numbers $j_1$ and $j_2$ and functions $h_1$ and $h_2$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} w_1^{j_1}=h_1\circ\Phi(w_1,w_2), \\ w_2^{j_2}=h_2\circ\Phi(w_1,w_2) \end{cases}$$

Then one can get

$$\begin{cases} w_1^{j_1}=z_1^{j_1}, \\ w_2^{j_2}=z_2^{j_2} \end{cases}$$

Thus, all local inverses $\rho$ must have the form:

$$\rho(z_1,z_2)=(\varepsilon_1 z_1,\varepsilon_2 z_2),$$

where $\varepsilon_1^{j_1}=\varepsilon_2^{j_2}=1$. So all admissible local inverses commute with each other under composition. Then by Theorem 1.1, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian.

The following is from [24, Example 8.4.3].

**Example 4.7.** *Let $\Omega$ be $\mathbb{D}^2$ or $\mathbb{B}_2$. Let*

$$p(z_1,z_2)=z_1^2+z_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad q(z_1,z_2)=z_1^2z_2^2,$$

*and*

$$\Phi=(p,q).$$

*There are exactly eight admissible local inverses of $\Phi$: $\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_8$, which are defined by*

$$\rho_1(z_1,z_2)=(z_1,z_2),\ \rho_2(z_1,z_2)=(-z_1,z_2),\ \rho_3(z_1,z_2)=(z_1,-z_2),$$

$$\rho_4(z_1,z_2)=(-z_1,-z_2);\rho_5(z_1,z_2)=(z_2,z_1),\ \rho_6(z_1,z_2)=(-z_2,z_1),$$

*and*

$$\rho_7(z_1,z_2)=(z_2,-z_1),\ \rho_8(z_1,z_2)=(-z_2,-z_1).$$

*Each $\rho_j$ defines a unitary operator $U_j$ on $L_a^2(\Omega)$ :*

$$U_jf=f\circ\rho_j,\ f\in L_a^2(\Omega).$$

*By Theorem 1.1, the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi)$ is generated by $\{U_j : 1 \leq j \leq 8\}$. Note that the deck transformation group $G(\Phi)$ equals $\{\rho_j : 1 \leq j \leq 8\}$. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi)$ is not abelian since $G(\Phi)$ is not abelian.*

Example 4.7 is notable since it tells the difference between multi-variable and single-variable cases. Douglas, Putinar and Wang's result [19] gives that $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$ is abelian if $B$ is a finite Blaschke product. Hence by (1.1), if $\phi$ is holomorphic on the closed unit disk $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\phi$ is not constant, then $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi, \mathbb{D})$ is abelian. But Example 4.7 shows that this fails in multi-variable case. In Section 6, we will see that the map $\Phi$ defined in Example 4.7 is a holomorphic proper map.

## 5. Proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5

In this section we will present the proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.5 and assume that $\Omega$ is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$. First we present the proof of Theorem 1.4.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** If $\Phi$ is biholomorphic, the only local inverse of $\Phi$ is the identity map and hence by the proof of Theorem 1.1, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is trivial. We will show that if $\Phi : \Omega \to \Omega'$ is a non-biholomorphic proper map then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is nontrivial.

First we show that each local inverse $\sigma$ of $\Phi$ is admissible in $\Omega$. To do this, let

$$\mathcal{E} = \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(Z)).$$

By Corollary 3.3, $\mathcal{E}$ is relatively closed and $L^2_a$-removable. We will show that for each curve $\gamma \subseteq \Omega - \mathcal{E}$, $\sigma$ admits analytic continuation with values in $\Omega$. In fact, by Proposition 3.5 $\Omega - \mathcal{E}$ is connected. Given a curve $\gamma$ in $\Omega - \mathcal{E}$, Theorem 2.2 shows that for each point $\lambda$ on $\gamma$ there exists an enough small ball $B_\lambda$ centered at $\lambda$ such that

$$\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(B_\lambda)) = \bigsqcup_{j=1}^{n} U_j(\lambda),$$

where $U_1(\lambda) = B_\lambda$, and each $U_j(\lambda)(1 \leq j \leq n)$ is a domain such that $\Phi|_{U_j(\lambda)}$ is biholomorphic. This integer $n$ only depends on $\Phi$. Then it is easy to define $n$ local inverses of $\Phi$ :

$$\rho_1^\lambda, \rho_2^\lambda, \cdots, \rho_n^\lambda,$$

which map $B_\lambda$ bijectively to $U_1(\lambda), \cdots, U_n(\lambda)$, respectively. Since $\gamma$ is compact, there are finitely may balls $B_{\lambda_k}(1 \leq k \leq N)$ whose union covers $\gamma$. After reordering them, we may require that

$$B_{\lambda_k} \cap B_{\lambda_{k+1}} \neq \emptyset,\ k = 1, \cdots, N-1.$$

Clearly, those local inverses $\{\rho_j^{\lambda_k}\}(1 \leq j \leq n)$ on $B_{\lambda_k}$ are direct continuations of $\{\rho_j^{\lambda_{k+1}}\}(1 \leq j \leq n)$ defined on $B_{\lambda_{k+1}}$, up to a permutation. Thus each local inverse admits analytic continuation along $\gamma$ with values in $\Omega$, as desired. Therefore, by arbitrariness of $\gamma$ all local inverses of $\Phi$ are admissible.

Since $\Phi$ is not biholomorphic, by Theorem 2.2 $\Phi$ is not univalent and hence there exists a nontrivial local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$. Recall that

$$\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]} h(w) = \sum_{\sigma \in [\rho]} h \circ \sigma(w) J\sigma(w), w \in \Omega - \mathcal{E}.$$

By the proof of Theorem 1.1, both $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho^-]}$ are bounded operators in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. The only modification here is to replace Theorem 1.3 with Corollary 3.3. Since $\rho$

is not the identity map, $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ is not a scalar multiple of the identity operator. This implies that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is nontrivial to complete the proof of Theorem 1.4. □

In fact, the proof of Corollary 3.3 gives that for a holomorphic proper map $\Phi$ over $\Omega$ and a zero variety $E$ of $\Omega$, $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(E))$ is locally contained in a zero variety. Thus, for a holomorphic proper map $\Phi$ on $\Omega$ and a local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$, there is a relatively closed subset $A$ of $\Omega$ such that $A$ is locally contained in a zero variety and for each curve $\gamma$ in $\Omega - A$, $\rho$ admits analytic continuation with values in $\Omega$. Now we are ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**Proof of Theorem 1.5.** To prove Theorem 1.5, we need show that the number of equivalent classes of local inverses of $\Phi$ equals the number of components of $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$. To do this, first we have two observations. On one hand, each point $(z,w)$ in $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$ has the form $(z,\rho(z))$ for some local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$, and there is a neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $(z,\rho(z))$ such that each point in $\mathcal{O}\cap\mathcal{S}_\Phi$ has the form $(\lambda,\rho(\lambda))$. On the other hand, for two local inverses $\rho$ and $\sigma$ of $\Phi$, they are equivalent if and only if there is a curve $\gamma$ along which $\rho$ admits analytic continuation $\sigma$. In this case, $(z,\rho(z))$ is jointed with $(w,\sigma(w))$ by a curve in $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$. Therefore, if $\rho$ is equivalent to $\sigma$, then their images lie in the same component of $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$. The converse is also true by a similar discussion. Thus, the number of equivalent classes of local inverses of $\Phi$ equals the number of components of $\mathcal{S}_\Phi$. This completes the proof. □

Given a discrete group $\Gamma$, recall that the group von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)$ is the weak closure of the linear span of all left regular representations $\{L_\rho : \rho\in\Gamma\}$ of $\Gamma$ on $l^2(\Gamma)$, defined by

$$L_\rho g(\sigma) = g(\rho^{-1}\sigma), \sigma\in\Gamma,\ g\in l^2(\Gamma).$$

Theorem 1.5 has an immediate corollary.

**Corollary 5.1.** *Suppose $\Phi$ is a holomorphic regular proper map on $\Omega$. Then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(G(\Phi))$, where $G(\Phi)$ is the deck transformation group of $\Phi$.*

*Proof.* Suppose $\Phi$ is a holomorphic regular proper map on $\Omega$. Then each local inverses of $\Phi$ extends to a member in $G(\Phi)$. Let

$$G(\Phi) = \{\rho_j : 1\le j\le n\}.$$

For each local inverse $\rho$ of $\Phi$, $\rho$ is in $G(\Phi)$, and thus $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$ defines a unitary operator in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$. Now we rewrite $\mathcal{E}_\rho$ for $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, and by Theorem 1.5 $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_\rho$ for $\rho$ in $G(\Phi)$. Noting

$$\mathcal{E}_\rho^*\mathcal{E}_\sigma^* = \mathcal{E}_{\rho\circ\sigma}^*,\ \rho,\sigma\in G(\Phi),$$

we define

$$\sum_{j=1}^n c_j\mathcal{E}_{\rho_j}^* \mapsto \sum_{j=1}^n c_j L_{\rho_j}.$$

Thus the above map gives a $*$-isomorphism from $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ to $\mathcal{L}(G(\Phi))$. □

Note that the assumption of Corollary 5.1 can be reformulated as: $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map and each local inverse of $\Phi$ is holomorphic in $\Omega$. To see this, suppose $\rho$ is a local inverse of $\Phi$, then so is its inverse $\rho^-$. Since both $\rho\circ\rho^-$ and $\rho^-\circ\rho$ locally are identity, and all local inverses of $\Phi$ are holomorphic in $\Omega$, it follows

that both $\rho$ and $\rho^-$ are holomorphic automorphisms of $\Omega$, forcing $\rho \in G(\Phi)$. Thus $\Phi$ is regular, as desired.

## 6. Concrete examples of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$

This section contains some examples of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, where $\Phi$ is often a holomorphic proper map. We focus on the abelian property of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. Let us begin with an example in single variable case, suggested by Professor Qiu [24].

**Example 6.1.** *For a fixed $r \in (0, 1)$, let*

$$V_r \triangleq \{z : r < |z| < \frac{1}{r}\},$$

*and*

$$W_r = \{x + iy : \frac{x^2}{(r + \frac{1}{r})^2} + \frac{y^2}{(r - \frac{1}{r})^2} < 1,\ x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

*Consider the Zhukovski function:*

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{2}(z + \frac{1}{z}), \quad z \in V_r.$$

*One can check that $f$ is a holomorphic proper map from $V_r$ to $W_r$. Define*

$$\rho_1(z) = z \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_2(z) = \frac{1}{z}.$$

*Then $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$ are the only local inverses of $f$. Define an operator $S$ on the Bergman space $L^2_a(V_r)$ by*

$$Sh(z) = h \circ \rho_2(z)\rho_2'(z),\ z \in V_r, h \in L^2_a(V_r).$$

*We conclude that the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{V}^*(f, V_r)$ equals the linear span of $I$ and $S$. In particular, $\mathcal{V}^*(f, V_r)$ is abelian.*

In general, for an $n$-connected bounded domain $\Omega$ in $\mathbb{C}$, a theorem of Bieberbach grantees that there always exist abundant holomorphic proper maps from $\Omega$ to the unit disk [4, 3, 8, 9].

We will present many examples of holomorphic proper maps on high dimensional domains. The following proposition tells us that the map $\Phi$ defined in Example 4.7 is a holomorphic proper map.

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let $\Omega$ be $\mathbb{D}^2$ or $\mathbb{B}_2$, and write $\Phi(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^2 + z_2^2, z_1^2 z_2^2)$. Then $\Phi(\Omega)$ is open and $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map from $\Omega$ to $\Phi(\Omega)$.*

*Proof.* Write $\Psi(z_1, z_2) = (z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2)$. We will first show that $\Psi$ is an open map in $\mathbb{C}^2$; that is, $\Psi$ maps each open ball to an open set. If so, noting that $\Phi(z_1, z_2) = \Psi(z_1^2, z_2^2)$, $\Phi$ is also an open map. To show $\Psi$ is open, we just need show that for a given point $w = (w_1, w_2)$ and for any neighborhood $U$ of $w$, $\Psi(U)$ contains an open ball centered at $\Psi(w)$. Write $\Psi(w) = (s_1, s_2)$, and note that $w_1$ and $w_2$ are zeros of the polynomial $v$ defined by

$$v(x) = x^2 - s_1 x + s_2.$$

Clearly, there exist two disks $D_1$ and $D_2$ centered at $w_1$ and $w_2$, respectively, and

$$D_1 \times D_2 \subseteq U.$$

If $w_1 \neq w_2$, we can require that $\overline{D_1} \cap \overline{D_2} = \emptyset$. By applications of Rouche's theorem on $\partial D_1$ and $\partial D_2$, respectively, if $s' = (s_1', s_2')$ is enough close to $\Psi(w)$, then the

polynomial $u(x) = x^2 - s_1'x + s_2'$ has exactly two zeros: one in $D_1$ and the other in $D_2$. If $w_1 = w_2$, then let $D_2 = D_1$. By similar discussion, the polynomial $u(x) = x^2 - s_1'x + s_2'$ has exactly two zeros in $D_1$. In either case, $\Psi(D_1 \times D_2)$ contains an open ball centered at $\Psi(w)$, and so does $\Psi(U)$. Therefore, both $\Psi$ and $\Phi$ are open maps.

Now it remains to prove that $\Phi$ is a proper map. In fact, noting $\Phi$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$, we have that $\Phi$ is a proper map if and only if $\Phi(\partial\Omega) \subseteq \partial\Phi(\Omega)$. Since $\Phi(\Omega)$ is open, it suffices to show that $\Phi(\partial\Omega) \cap \Phi(\Omega) = \emptyset$. To do this, fix $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ and $\mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2)$. Write

$$x_1 = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 = \lambda_1^2\lambda_2^2.$$

Then $\lambda_1^2$ and $\lambda_2^2$ are the solutions of the equation

$$x^2 - x_1x + x_2 = 0\,(x \in \mathbb{C}).$$

Therefore, $\Phi(\lambda) = \Phi(\mu)$ if and only if $(\lambda_1^2, \lambda_2^2)$ is a permutation of $(\mu_1^2, \mu_2^2)$. This is equivalent to that there exists a member $\rho \in G(\Phi)$ (see Example 4.7) satisfying

$$\mu = \rho(\lambda).$$

Since both $\Omega$ and $\partial\Omega$ are invariant under $G(\Phi)$. If $\Phi(\lambda) = \Phi(\mu)$, we have that $\lambda \in \partial\Omega$ if and only if $\mu \in \partial\Omega$. This gives $\Phi(\partial\Omega) \cap \Phi(\Omega) = \emptyset$, to complete the proof. □

From the proof of Proposition 6.2, we see that if $\Omega$ is replaced with any domain invariant under the deck transformation group $G(\Phi)$, then the same results hold. Similarly, one can prove that $(z_1 + z_2, z_1^2 + z_2^2)$ is a holomorphic proper map on either $\mathbb{D}^2$ or $\mathbb{B}_2$. By the same idea, one can also show that for positive integers $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_d$, $(z_1^{\alpha_1}, z_2^{\alpha_2}, \cdots, z_d^{\alpha_d})$ defines a holomorphic proper map on $\mathbb{B}_d$. In these cases, a direct application of Corollary 5.1 shows that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(G(\Phi))$. In fact, Proposition 6.2 induces more holomorphic proper maps as shown in the following example.

**Example 6.3.** *Suppose $\Phi = (z_1z_2^2, z_1 + z_2^2)$. Since $\Phi$ is the composition of $(z_1z_2, z_1 + z_2)$ and $(z_1, z_2^2)$, $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\mathbb{D}^2$. By Theorem 1.5, studying the structure of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$ reduces to determining all admissible local inverses of $\Phi$ on $\mathbb{D}^2$. To do so, we will solve the following equation in $\mathbb{D}^2$:*

$$\Phi(w) = \Phi(z).$$

*The proof of Proposition 6.2 gives that $\Phi(z) = \Phi(w)$ if and only if one of the following holds:*

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = z_1, \\ w_2^2 = z_2^2, \end{cases}$$

*or*

$$\begin{cases} w_1 = z_2^2, \\ w_2^2 = z_1. \end{cases}$$

*By solving these equations, we get three equivalent classes of admissible local inverses of $\Phi$: $(z_1, z_2)$, $(z_1, -z_2)$ and*

$$(z_2^2, \pm\sqrt{z_1}).$$

*These local inverses naturally derives three operators in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$: $I$, $S_1$ and $S_2$, defined by*

$$S_1f(z_1, z_2) = f(z_1, -z_2),\ (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2,$$

*and*

$$S_2 f(z_1, z_2) = \frac{z_2}{\sqrt{z_1}}[-f(z_2^2, \sqrt{z_1}) + f(z_2^2, -\sqrt{z_1})],\ (z_1, z_2) \in (\mathbb{D} - \{0\}) \times \mathbb{D},$$

*for $f \in L_a^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Thus the dimension of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$ equals 3. For a finite dimensional von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A}$ on a Hilbert space $H$, $\mathcal{A}$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{k=1}^r M_{n_k}(\mathbb{C})$* [17, Theorem III.1.2]. *Thus $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, and so $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian.*

*We have to point out that $\Phi$ is not a proper map on $\mathbb{B}_d$. On the other hand, $\Phi$ has exactly two admissible local inverses on $\mathbb{B}_d$: $(z_1, z_2)$, $(z_1, -z_2)$. Then by Theorem 1.1, $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2) = 2$, and then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$.*

To contrast with Example 6.3 we have the following interesting example.

**Example 6.4.** *Suppose $\Phi = (z_1^2 z_2^4, z_1^2 + z_2^4)$. Then $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\mathbb{D}^2$ but not on $\mathbb{B}_2$. By the argument in Example 6.3 we get exactly twelve equivalent classes of admissible local inverses of $\Phi$ on $\mathbb{D}^2$:*

$$(z_1, i^k z_2),\ (-z_1, -i^k z_2),\ (1 \le k \le 4);$$

$$(z_2^2, \pm\sqrt{z_1}), (-z_2^2, \pm\sqrt{z_1}); (z_2^2, \pm i\sqrt{z_1}), (-z_2^2, \pm i\sqrt{z_1}).$$

*A simple computation gives that not all these equivalent classes commute with each other under composition. Theorem 1.5 gives that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is not abelian.*

*But there are only eight admissible local inverses of $\Phi$ on $\mathbb{B}_2$: $(z_1, i^k z_2)$ and $(-z_1, i^k z_2)(1 \le k \le 4)$, each corresponding to a unitary operator in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2)$. Applying Theorem 1.1 shows that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(G(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2))$. Note that $G(\Phi, \mathbb{B}_2)$ is abelian but not cyclic.*

In single-variable case, all known abelian deck transformation groups $G(\Phi)$ are $*$-isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_n$ or $\mathbb{Z}$, a cyclic group. For example, the deck transformation group $G(z^n)$ of $z^n$ over $\mathbb{D}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}_n$. If $\Phi(z) = \exp(-\frac{1+z}{1-z})$, then $\Phi$ is a covering map from $\mathbb{D}$ onto $\mathbb{D} - \{0\}$, and $G(\Phi)$ is isomorphic to $\pi_1(\mathbb{D} - \{0\}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$. Example 6.4 provides a different example.

The following example is of interest in its own to contrast with the main result in [19] that for each finite Blaschke product $B$, $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$ is abelian.

**Example 6.5.** *Given a finite Blaschke product $B$, let*

$$\Phi_B = (B(z_1) + B(z_2), B(z_1)B(z_2)), (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2.$$

*Observe that $\Phi_B$ is the composition of two proper maps $(z_1+z_2, z_1 z_2)$ and $(B(z_1), B(z_2))$. Thus $\Phi_B$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\mathbb{D}^2$. We claim that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_B, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is abelian if and only if order $B$=1. First assume order $B > 1$, and we will show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_B, \mathbb{D}^2)$ is nonabelian. The special case of $B(z_1) = z_1^2$ is Proposition 6.2. To do this, we solve the following equation in the bidisk $\mathbb{D}^2$:*

$$\Phi_B(w) = \Phi_B(w).$$

*It is not difficult to see either*

$$\begin{cases} B(w_1) = B(z_1), \\ B(w_2) = B(z_2), \end{cases}$$

*or*

$$\begin{cases} B(w_1) = B(z_2), \\ B(w_2) = B(z_1). \end{cases}$$

*Then either* $(w_1, w_2) = (\rho(z_1), \tau(z_2))$ *or* $(w_1, w_2) = (\rho(z_2), \tau(z_1))$, *where both* $\rho$ *and* $\tau$ *are local inverses of* $B$. *Since order* $B > 1$ *and* $B$ *is proper, there is a local inverse* $\sigma$ *different from the identity map on* $\mathbb{D}$. *Now consider the following admissible local inverse classes of* $\Phi_B$ :

$$([\sigma](z_1), z_2),\ (z_2, z_1),$$

***where*** $([\sigma](z_1), z_2)$ ***denotes the family of those maps*** $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto (\widetilde{\sigma}(z_1), z_2)$ ***with*** $\widetilde{\sigma}$ ***running over the equivalent classes*** $[\sigma]$ ***of*** $\sigma$***, and*** $(z_2, z_1)$ ***denotes the map*** $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto (z_2, z_1)$***.*** *It is easy to check that they do not commute. Then by Theorem 1.1* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_B, \mathbb{D}^2)$ *is not abelian.*

*On the other hand, if order* $B = 1$, *then by applying the proof of Proposition 6.2 we deduce that* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_B, \mathbb{D}^2) = \mathbb{C}I$ *and* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_B, \mathbb{D}^2)$ *is abelian. Therefore,* $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi_B, \mathbb{D}^2)$ *is abelian if and only if order* $B$*=1.*

Inspired by Proposition 6.2, we consider the permutation groups $S_d$ ($d \geq 2$). Write

$$\phi_1 = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} z_j,$$
$$\phi_2 = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} z_i z_j,$$
$$\cdots$$

and $\phi_d = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_d$ [24, Chapter 8]. Also put $\Phi = (\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_d)$.

**Proposition 6.6.** *As defined above,* $\Phi$ *is an open map on* $\mathbb{C}^d$. *Furthermore,* $\Phi$ *is a holomorphic proper map on* $\Omega$ *if* $\Omega$ *is invariant under* $S_d$.

*Proof.* First we will prove that $\Phi$ is an open map on $\mathbb{C}^d$. To see this, we first show that for each $\lambda$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$, $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\lambda))$ is a finite set. This reduces to show that $\Phi(\lambda) = \Phi(\mu)$ if and only if there is a permutation $\rho$ on $\mathbb{C}^d$ such that $\mu = \rho(\lambda)$. In fact, write $\Phi(\lambda) = w$ and $w = (w_1, \cdots, w_d)$. Consider the complex equation in $x$:

$$x^d - w_1 x^{d-1} + \cdots + (-1)^{d-1} w_{d-1} x + (-1)^d w_d = 0.$$

Let $Q$ denote the polynomial defined by the left hand side of this equation. Since $\Phi(\lambda) = w$, $\lambda$ are the $d$ zeros of $Q$, counting multiplicity. Since

$$\Phi(\lambda) = \Phi(\mu),$$

$\mu$ are the $d$ zeros of $Q$. Therefore, up to a permutation $\mu$ equals $\lambda$, as desired. Then applying Theorem 2.1 shows that $\Phi$ is an open map on $\mathbb{C}^d$.

Using the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 6.2, one can show that $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$ if $\Omega$ is invariant under $S_d$. □

Let $\Phi$ be defined as above Proposition 6.6. The deck transformation group $G(\Phi)$ of $\Phi$ is isomorphic to $S_d$. Since $\Omega$ is invariant under $S_d$, by Corollary 5.1 $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is $*$-isomorphic to $\mathcal{L}(S_d)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is abelian if and only if $S_d$ is abelian, if and only if $d = 1, 2$. In the case of $\Omega = \mathbb{B}_d$ or $\mathbb{D}^d$, this was obtained by [24, Proposition 8.4.6].

As holomorphic proper maps are natural generalizations of finite Blaschke products on the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$, it is reasonable to ask whether and to what extent (1.1) holds. To the best of our knowledge, it is not known whether it holds on multi-connected planar domains. But in general, it's plain generalization fails in multi-variable case, which is to be demonstrated in the next section. Also, we will see that deformation plays an important role in the structures of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ and $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$.

## 7. Deformation of the domains

In this section, under the deformation of the domain $\Omega$ we will study what happens to the von Neumann $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ and the commutant $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$. It turns out that in multi-variable case they diverge a lot. Also, different definitions of representing local inverse are presented and some differences between $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ and $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ are shown. For simplicity, *in this section we require all domains satisfy the properties (1) and (2) defined in introduction.*

We begin with an observation. Let $\widetilde{\Omega}$ be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$ with $d \geq 2$, and $\Omega = \widetilde{\Omega} - K$ is a domain, where $K$ is a compact subset of $\widetilde{\Omega}$. Letting $\Phi$ denote a family of holomorphic functions over $\Omega$, we will see $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ equals $\{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'$ in the following sense. By Hartogs' extension theorem each holomorphic function in $\Omega$ uniquely extends to a function holomorphic on $\widetilde{\Omega}$. Furthermore, there is a bounded linear bijection between the Bergman spaces $L^2_a(\Omega)$ and $L^2_a(\widetilde{\Omega})$. Precisely,

$$f \mapsto \widetilde{f},\ f \in L^2_a(\Omega)$$

where $\widetilde{f}$ denotes the holomorphic extension of $f$ to $\widetilde{\Omega}$. For an operator $S \in \{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$, $S$ naturally induces an operator in $\{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'$. More precisely,

$$\widetilde{S}\widetilde{f} = \widetilde{Sf},\ f \in L^2_a(\widetilde{\Omega}).$$

It remains to check that $\widetilde{S} \in \{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'$. Let $\phi$ be a member in $\Phi$ and we regard $\phi$ as a holomorphic function over $\widetilde{\Omega}$. For any $f \in L^2_a(\Omega)$,

$$SM_{\phi,\Omega}f = M_{\phi,\Omega}Sf.$$

That is,

$$S(\phi f) = \phi Sf.$$

Therefore,

$$\widetilde{S}M_{\phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\widetilde{f} = \widetilde{S}(\phi\widetilde{f}) = \widetilde{S}(\widetilde{\phi f}) = \widetilde{S(\phi f)} = \widetilde{\phi Sf} = \phi\widetilde{Sf} = M_{\phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\widetilde{S}\widetilde{f}.$$

Then $\widetilde{S} \in \{M_{\phi,\Omega}\}'$. This gives that $\widetilde{S}$ is in $\{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'$.

Conversely, given $\widetilde{S} \in \{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'$, let

$$Sf = \widetilde{S}\widetilde{f}$$

for each $f$ in $L^2_a(\Omega)$. Using similar argument as above one gives that $S$ is in $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ corresponding to $\widetilde{S}$. In this sense, we write

$$\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}' = \{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'.$$

But to compare $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ with $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega})$ we have a different story. Proposition 7.3 gives that for a nontrivial $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega})$, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ may be trivial. In addition, we emphasize that in single variable case

$$\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}' = \{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'$$

usually fails. A main reason is that in most cases $H^\infty(\Omega) \neq H^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega})$.

Let $\widetilde{\Omega}\Delta\Omega$ denote the symmetric difference of the sets $\widetilde{\Omega}$ and $\Omega$, and $O(\partial\Omega,\varepsilon)$ the $\varepsilon$-neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$. The following proposition shows that the dimension of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ will not increase and the abelian property of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is preserved under a small deformation of $\Omega$.

**Proposition 7.1.** *Suppose $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a holomorphic map on $\overline{\Omega}$ and the image of $\Phi$ has an interior point. Then there is a positive number $\varepsilon$ such that for any domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ satisfying $\widetilde{\Omega}\Delta\Omega \subseteq O(\partial\Omega, \varepsilon)$,*

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega}) \leq \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega).$$

*Furthermore, if $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is abelian, then so is $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega})$.*

In Proposition 7.1, if $\varepsilon$ is large, then it is possible that

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega}) > \dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega).$$

For example, for a finite Blaschke product $B$ with order $n(n > 2)$, it is shown that $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D}) \leq n$ in [21] and in most cases $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D}) = 2$ in [24]. But there is a connected compact set $K$ of $\mathbb{D}$ such that the restriction of $B$ on $\mathbb{D} - K$ is a covering map whose deck transformation group is a finite cyclic group [19]. Furthermore, it is shown that $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D} - K)$ is abelian as well as $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D})$, and $\dim \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D} - K) = n$. Thus

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D} - K) > \dim \mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D}).$$

Now we turn to the proof of Proposition 7.1.

**Proof of Proposition 7.1.** Since $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is holomorphic on $\overline{\Omega}$, there is a positive number $\delta$ such that $\Phi$ is holomorphic in the $\delta$-neighborhood of $\overline{\Omega}$. Each operator $S$ in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ has the form as (4.12):

$$Sg(w) = \sum_{\rho} c_\rho \mathcal{E}_{[\rho]} g(w),$$

where each $\rho$ is a representing local inverse. To show

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega}) \leq \dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega),$$

it suffices to show that if a local inverse $\rho$ is not representing for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$, then it is not representing for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega})$. Recall that a local inverse is not representing if and only if one local inverse in its equivalent class is not representing. By Proposition 4.2, all representing local inverses are exactly admissible local inverses, and their family is closed under analytic continuation. Without loss of generality assume that there is a point $\lambda \in \Omega - \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$ such that $\rho(\lambda) \notin \overline{\Omega}$, but $\rho(\lambda)$ still lies in the $\delta$-neighborhood of $\Omega$. If the deformation is enough small such that

$$\lambda \in \widetilde{\Omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\lambda) \notin \overline{\widetilde{\Omega}}, \tag{7.1}$$

then by the comments below Proposition 4.2 $\rho$ is not representing for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega})$. Since there are finitely many local inverses for $\Phi$ (either representing or not), one can find a positive number $\varepsilon$ such that (7.1) is satisfied for all non-representing local inverses $\rho$ for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ if $\widetilde{\Omega}\Delta\Omega \subseteq O(\partial\Omega, \varepsilon)$. Thus we have proved

$$\dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega}) \leq \dim \mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega).$$

To prove that the abelian property is preserved under a small perturbation, we observe that those operators in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ or $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega})$ have local representations. Theorem 1.1 gives that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is generated by $\mathcal{E}_{[\rho]}$, where $\rho$ run over admissible local inverses of $\Phi$. To show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega})$ is abelian if $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is abelian, we need an observation: the representing local inverses and related equivalent classes for

$\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega})$ are "contained" in those of $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ under a small deformation of $\Omega$. In fact, there are only finitely many representing local inverses for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$, say

$$\rho_1,\cdots,\rho_N.$$

Let $\rho_{j_1},\cdots,\rho_{j_k}$ consist of an equivalent class $[\rho_{j_1}]_\Omega$, where we use $\Omega$ to note that those analytic continuations are done via curves in $\Omega$. Then one can find a point $a\in\Omega$ and $k-1$ loops in $\Omega$ such that $\rho_{j_1}$ is analytic at $a$ and admits analytic continuation $\rho_{j_s}(2\le s\le k)$ along these $k-1$ loops. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the closure of a domain containing these $k-1$ loops so that $\mathcal{K}\subseteq\Omega$. Then under a small permutation of $\Omega$,

$$\mathcal{K}\subseteq\widetilde{\Omega}.$$

Therefore, $\rho_{j_1}$ admits analytic continuation $\rho_{j_s}$ along the same loops in $\widetilde{\Omega}$. Since there are only finitely many local inverses and loops involved, we may assume $\mathcal{K}$ is enough large so that all analytic continuations admitted by $\rho_j(1\le j\le N)$ in $\Omega$ can also be done in $\widetilde{\Omega}$, and in this sense we write

$$[\rho_j]_\Omega\subseteq[\rho_j]_{\widetilde{\Omega}},\ 1\le j\le N.$$

Thus for each $j$, $[\rho_j]_{\widetilde{\Omega}}$ is the union of several distinct members $[\rho_k]_\Omega$. Then by Theorem 1.1 it immediately follows that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega})$ is abelian if $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\Omega)$ is abelian. The proof is completed. □

By Corollary 1.2, the necessary and sufficient condition for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega})\neq\mathbb{C}I$ is that there exists a nontrivial admissible local inverse $\rho$ for $\widetilde{\Omega}$. That is, there is a local inverse $\rho$ ($\rho(z)\not\equiv z$) such that for each local inverse $\sigma\in[\rho]$ defined in a subdomain in $\widetilde{\Omega}$, the image of $\sigma$ is contained in $\widetilde{\Omega}$. In short, we write

$$[\rho]\big(\widetilde{\Omega}-\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))\big)\subseteq\widetilde{\Omega}. \tag{7.2}$$

As $\Omega$ is fixed, we can find a point $w$ outside $\overline{\Omega}\cup\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$ but in the $\varepsilon$-neighborhood $\mathcal{N}$ of $\Omega$. By the proof of the former part of Theorem 1.1 there exist finitely many points in $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(w))$ in the closure of $\mathcal{N}$. Draw a smooth curve $\gamma$ in $\mathcal{N}$ which connects $w$ and a point in $\Omega$ such that

$$\gamma\cap\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(w))=\{w\}.$$

Then thicken $\gamma$ and smoothen it, we get a larger domain $\widehat{\Omega}$. Then one can check that the only admissible local inverse of $\Phi$ on $\widehat{\Omega}$ is the identity map. To see this, write

$$\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(w))\cap\widehat{\Omega}=\{w_1,\cdots,w_K,w\}.$$

Noting

$$\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(w))\cap\widehat{\Omega}\cap\overline{Z}=\emptyset,$$

we can get $K+1$ disjoint domains $U_0,U_1,\cdots,U_k$ such that

$$\Phi(U_0)=\Phi(U_j),\ 1\le j\le K,$$

and $\Phi|_{U_j}(0\le j\le K)$ are biholomorphic; in addition, we require that $w\in U_0$ and $U_0$ contains a boundary point $\lambda$ of $\widehat{\Omega}$. This can be done because the thicken part of $\gamma$ can be as thin as possible. For each local inverse $\eta$ distinct from the identity,

$$[\eta](\lambda)\subseteq\bigsqcup_{j=1}^{K}U_j.$$

Then some member in $[\eta^-]$ maps a point in $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^K U_j$ to $\lambda$, and thus by (7.2) $\eta^-$ can not be an admissible local inverse. By the comment below Proposition 4.2, $\eta$ is not admissible. Thus there is no nontrivial admissible local inverses for $\widehat{\Omega}$. Then applying Theorem 1.1 gives the following theorem.

**Theorem 7.2.** *Suppose $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a holomorphic map on $\overline{\Omega}$ and the image of $\Phi$ has an interior point. For any positive number $\varepsilon$ there is a domain $\widehat{\Omega}$ satisfying $\widehat{\Omega}\Delta\Omega \subseteq O(\partial\Omega, \varepsilon)$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widehat{\Omega})$ is trivial.*

Furthermore, by Proposition 7.1 there is a positive number $\delta$ such that $\delta < \varepsilon$ and for any domain $\widetilde{\Omega}$ satisfying $\widehat{\Omega}\Delta\widetilde{\Omega} \subseteq O(\partial\widehat{\Omega}, \delta)$ and $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \widetilde{\Omega})$ is trivial. Thus under the assumption of Theorem 7.2, for small deformations $\Omega'$ of $\Omega$, $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega')$ are often trivial.

**Proposition 7.3.** *Suppose $\Phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{C}^d$ is a holomorphic map on $\overline{\Omega}$. For each $\lambda \in \Omega$, and $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists an open ball $U$ satisfying $U \subseteq B(\lambda, \varepsilon)$ such that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega - \overline{U})$ is trivial.*

*Proof.* Since the Lebesgue measure of $\partial\Omega$ is zero, one can show that the Lebesgue measure of $\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\partial\Omega))$ is also zero. Then there is a point $\widetilde{\lambda}$ in the ball $B(\lambda, \frac{\varepsilon}{2})$ such that

$$\Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\widetilde{\lambda})) \cap Z = \emptyset = \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\widetilde{\lambda})) \cap \partial\Omega.$$

We pick $\Delta_1 = B(\widetilde{\lambda}, \frac{\varepsilon'}{2})$ where $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ is so small such that there are finitely may disjoint domains $\Delta_1, \cdots, \Delta_N$ and biholomorphic maps $\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_N$ on $\Delta_1$ satisfying

$$\bigcup_{j=1}^N \Delta_j = \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\Delta_1)) \cap \Omega$$

and

$$\rho_j(\Delta_1) = \Delta_j \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \circ \rho_j = \Phi,\ 1 \leq j \leq N,$$

where $\rho_1(z) \equiv z$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\Omega - \overline{\Delta_1}$ is connected. Note that $\Delta_1 \cap (\Omega - \overline{\Delta_1}) = \emptyset$, and

$$\bigcup_{2 \leq j \leq N} \Delta_j \subseteq \Omega - \overline{\Delta_1}.$$

Since $\rho_j^-(\Delta_j) = \Delta_1$ for all $j$, by the comments after Proposition 4.2 $\rho_k^-$ $(2 \leq k \leq N)$ are not representing local inverse for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega - \overline{\Delta_1})$, and nor are their inverses $\rho_k (2 \leq k \leq N)$. Since $\rho_k (1 \leq k \leq N)$ are all possible local inverses, the only representing local inverse is the identity map $\rho_1$. Since each operator $S$ in $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega - \overline{\Delta_1})$ has the form (4.5), we obtain $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega - \overline{U}) = \mathbb{C}I$ if we choose $U$ to be $\Delta_1$ to complete the proof. □

Proposition 7.3 reveals great difference between $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ and $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$. By the second paragraph of this section, $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ and $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega-\overline{U}}\}'$ can be regarded as the same. But Theorem 1.4 tells us that if $\Phi$ is a holomorphic proper map on $\Omega$ and is not biholomorphic, then $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ is nontrivial and Proposition 7.3 gives that one can pick an open ball $\overline{U}$ such that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega - \overline{U})$ is trivial. A concrete example is constructed as follows.

**Example 7.4.** *Let $\widetilde{\Omega}$ denote the unit ball $\mathbb{B}_2$ or $\mathbb{D}^2$. Let $U$ denote the open ball of radius $\frac{1}{100}$ centered at $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{i}{2})$, respectively. Write*

$$\Omega = \widetilde{\Omega} - \overline{U},$$

*and*

$$\Phi(z_1, z_2) = (z_1^2 + z_2^2, z_1^2 z_2^2).$$

*As done in Example 4.7, we have local inverses $\rho_1, \cdots, \rho_8$ and bounded operators $U_1, \cdots, U_8$. For $1 \leq j \leq 8$,*

$$U_j \in \{M_{\Phi,\widetilde{\Omega}}\}'.$$

*By the discussion at the beginning of this section,*

$$U_j \in \{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}', 1 \leq j \leq 8.$$

*We will show that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega) = \mathbb{C}I$. To do this, note that*

$$\rho_j^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{i}{2}) \in \Omega,\ 2 \leq j \leq 8.$$

*But*

$$\rho_j[\rho_j^{-1}(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{i}{2})] \notin \Omega, 2 \leq j \leq 8.$$

*Then by the comments after Proposition 4.2 $\rho_j (2 \leq j \leq 8)$ are not admissible local inverses for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$. Applying Theorem 1.1 shows that $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega) = \mathbb{C}I$.*

Inspired by [36], we present a different definition for representing local inverse. Suppose that $\Phi$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\Omega}$, and there is an operator $T$ in $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ such that

$$Tg(w) = \sum_{j=1}^{N'} s_j(w) g(\rho_j(w)),\ w \in \Delta,$$

where $s_j$ are holomorphic over $\Delta$, and $s_k \not\equiv 0$, then $\rho_k$ is called *a representing local inverse* (on $\Delta$) for $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$. Example 7.4 shows that local inverses representing for $\{M_{\Phi,\Omega}\}'$ and those representing for $\mathcal{V}^*(\Phi, \Omega)$ can be different. But in single-variable case, they are the same under a mild condition [36].

Recall that $\mathcal{V}^*(z, \mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{C}I$ and $\{M_{z,\mathbb{D}}\}' = \{M_{h,\mathbb{D}} : h \in H^\infty(\mathbb{D})\}$. It is clear that for a finite Blaschke product $B$, $\mathcal{V}^*(B, \mathbb{D}) = \mathcal{V}^*(z, \mathbb{D})$ if and only if

$$\{M_{B,\mathbb{D}}\}' = \{M_{z,\mathbb{D}}\}'.$$

Thomson's proof [36] indeed shows that for a function $\phi$ holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, $\mathcal{V}^*(\phi, \mathbb{D}) = \mathcal{V}^*(z, \mathbb{D})$ if and only if $\{M_{\phi,\mathbb{D}}\}' = \{M_{z,\mathbb{D}}\}'$. But Example 7.4 shows that this fails in multi-variable case.

Now we reformulate (1.1) as follows. If $\phi$ is holomorphic over $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$, then there exist a holomorphic proper map $\psi$ on $\mathbb{D}$ and an $H^\infty$-function $h$ on $\psi(\mathbb{D})$ such that $\phi = h \circ \psi$ and $\{M_{\phi,\mathbb{D}}\}' = \{M_{\psi,\mathbb{D}}\}'$. This fails in high dimensional case, see the following.

**Example 7.5.** *Let $\Phi$, $\Omega$, and $U_j, \rho_j (1 \leq j \leq 8)$ be defined as in Example 7.4. Suppose conversely that there is a holomorphic proper function $\Psi$ on $\Omega$ such that*

$$\{M_\Phi\}' = \{M_\Psi\}',$$

*and $\Phi$ can be written as a function of $\Psi$. We will derive a contradiction. In fact,*

$$U_j \in \{M_\Phi\}' = \{M_\Psi\}',\ 1 \leq j \leq 8.$$

*This implies*

$$\Psi \circ \rho_j = \Psi, 1 \leq j \leq 8,$$

*and $\Psi$ is at least an 8-folds map, see Theorem 2.2. Since $\Phi$ can be written as a function of $\Psi$, $\Phi - \Phi(\lambda)$ has at least 8 roots once $\lambda \notin \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$, where $Z$ denotes the zeros of $J\Phi$. Note that $(\frac{i}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) \in \Omega - \Phi^{-1}(\Phi(\overline{Z}))$ and $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{i}{2}) \notin \Omega$. Write $w = (\frac{i}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, and $\Phi - w$ has exactly 7 roots in $\Omega$. This is a contraction. Therefore, a generalization of (1.1) fails in this case.*

**Acknowledgements.** This work is partially supported by NSFC(11271387, 11471113, 11571064), Chongqing Natural Science Foundation (cstc 2013jjB0050), Simons Foundation grant #196300 and CSC(201406745016). The work was initialized when the first author visited Vanderbilt University. The first author thanks the Department of Mathematics, Vanderbilt University for hospitality during his visit.

## References

[1] W. Arveson, *A short course on spectral theory*, GTM **209**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.
[2] W. Arveson, *An invitation to C*-algebras*, GTM **39**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
[3] S. Bell, *The Bergman kernel function and proper holomorphic mappings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **270**(1982), 685-691.
[4] L. Bieberbach, *Uber einen Riemannschen Satz aus der Lehre von der konformen Abbildung*, Sitz.-Ber. Berliner Math. Ges. **24**(1925), 6-9.
[5] A. Bjorn, *Removable singularities for weighted Bergman spaces*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, **56**(2006), 179-227.
[6] S. Bochner, *Weak solutions of linear partial differential equations*, J. Math. Pure Appl. **35** (1956), 193-202.
[7] W. Boothby, *An introduction to differentiable manifolds and Riemannian geometry*, Pure and Applied Mathematics Series **120**, Gulf Professional Publishing, 2003.
[8] S. Bell, F. Kaleem, *The structure of the semigroup of proper holomorphic mappings of a planar domain to the unit disc*, arXiv: math.CV/0703200v1.
[9] M. Bourque, M. Younsi, *Analytic capacity and rational Ahlfors functions*, arXiv: math.CV/1307.5042v3.
[10] L. Carleson, *Selected problems on exceptional sets*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N. J., 1967.
[11] E. Chirka, *Complex analytic sets*, Mathematics and its Applications (Soviet Series), **46**, Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989.
[12] C. Cowen, *The commutant of an analytic Toeplitz operator*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **239**(1978), 1-31.
[13] C. Cowen, *The commutant of an analytic Toeplitz operator, II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **29**(1980), 1-12.
[14] C. Cowen, *An analytic Toeplitz operator that commutes with a compact operator and a related class of Toeplitz operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **36**(1980), 169-184. Theory, **7**(1982), 167-172.
[15] C. Cowen, *Finite Blaschke products as composition of other finite Blaschke products*, arXiv: math.CV/1207.4010v1
[16] C. Cowen and R. Wahl, *Commutants of finite Blaschke product multiplication operators*, preprint.
[17] K. Davidson, *C*-algebras by example*, Fields Institute Monographs, **6**, AMS, Rhode Island, 1996.
[18] H. Dan and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators defined by a class of polynomials on $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, **80**(2014), 581-601, arXiv: math.OA/1404.5414v1.

[19] R. Douglas, M. Putinar and K. Wang, *Reducing subspaces for analytic multipliers of the Bergman space*, J. Funct. Anal. **263**(2012), 1744-1765, arXiv: math.FA/1110.4920v1.
[20] R. Douglas, S. Sun and D. Zheng, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space via analytic continuation*, Adv. Math. **226**(2011), 541-583.
[21] K. Guo and H. Huang, *On multiplication operators of the Bergman space: Similarity, unitary equivalence and reducing subspaces*, J. Operator Theory, **65**(2011), 355-378.
[22] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators defined by covering maps on the Bergman space: the connection between operator theory and von Neumann algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **260**(2011), 1219-1255.
[23] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Geometric constructions of thin Blaschke products and reducing subspace problem*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **109**(2015), 1050-1091, arXiv: math.FA/1307.0174v1.
[24] K. Guo and H. Huang, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman space*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2145, doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-46845-6_1.
[25] H. Huang and D. Zheng, *Operators on the Bergman spaces on polygons vs geometry of polygons*, preprint.
[26] K. Guo and X. Wang, *Reducing subspaces of tensor products of weighted shifts*, preprint.
[27] S. Krantz, *Function theory of several complex variables*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, A Wiley-Interscience Publication, Inc., New York, 1982.
[28] S. Krantz, H. Parks, *The implicit function theorem: history, theory, and applications*, Springer Science and Business Media New York, Birkhäuser Basel, 2003.
[29] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in one complex variable*, Princeton University Press, Ann. of Math. Stud. **160**, 2006.
[30] R. Remmert, *Projektionen analytischer Mengen*, Math. Ann. **130**(1956), 410-441.
[31] R. Remmert, *Holomorphe und meromorphe Abbildungen komplexer Räume* Math. Ann. **133**, 1957, 328-370.
[32] W. Rudin, *Function theory in polydiscs*, Benjamin, New York, 1969.
[33] W. Rudin, *Function theory in the unit ball of* $\mathbb{C}^n$, Grundlehren der Math. **241**, Springer, New York, 1980.
[34] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.
[35] S. Sun, D. Zheng and C. Zhong, *Classification of reducing subspaces of a class of multiplication operators via the Hardy space of the bidisk*, Canad. J. Math. **62**(2010), 415-438.
[36] J. Thomson, *The commutant of a class of analytic Toeplitz operators*, Amer. J. Math. **99**(1977), 522-529.
[37] J. Thomson, *The commutant of a class of analytic Toeplitz operators II*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **25**(1976), 793-800.
[38] A. Tikaradze, *Multiplication operators on the Bergman spaces of pseudoconvex domains*, arXiv: math.FA/arXiv:1310.3554v3.
[39] X. Wang, H. Dan and H. Huang, *Reducing subspaces of multiplication operators with the symbol* $\alpha z^k + \beta w^l$ *on* $L^2_a(\mathbb{D}^2)$, Sci. China Ser. A. **58**(2015), doi: 10.1007/s11425-015-4973-9

Department of Mathematics, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, 200237, China, E-mail: hshuang@ecust.edu.cn
Center of Mathematics, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 401331, China and Department of Mathematics, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, 37240, United States, E-mail: dechao.zheng@vanderbilt.edu